

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



Matthew Cooke, xxx. P.m.; P.2

A FEW MORE WORDS

J,

UPON THE DEGREE OF

PRINCE GRAND ROSE CROIX.

*Chancery*  
RC

"For ye shall know the Truth, and the TRUTH shall make you free."—JOHN 8 chap. 32 verse.

---

PRINTED BY JAMES GRAY, MARYBOROUGH.

1845.



## P R E F A C E.

---

THE following correspondence is published by some friends of the Grand Chapter, for the purpose of enabling the Freemasonic community to form for itself, respecting the matters in question, a fair and dispassionate opinion, founded, not upon anonymous statements, of which no person will venture to assume the responsibility, but upon the authenticated arguments and averments, alleged and relied upon by those, who are among the best informed of the parties at issue.

The contending parties are, the Freemasons of Ireland,—almost all of whom are now the adherents of one or other of the two rival bodies, called the Grand Chapter of Ireland, and the Supreme Grand Council of Rites. Prince Masonry is the subject of the dispute;—and in the present Tract is contained a full and complete account of the question, as it has been elaborately stated and argued, between Mr. Fowler and Mr. O'Connor.

Of the latter gentleman,—as his views of the case coincide entirely with our own,—we might not be able to speak without some suspicion of partiality, were we to go further than simply to announce the fact, that he has taken much pains,—more, perhaps, than the subject was worth,—to investigate the history of the *Rose Croix* degree in Ireland, since its introduction, or revival, about the period 1780—1784, down to the present day,—and that he is among those who possess the confidence of his Chapter, of which he is a past Sovereign.

Of Mr. Fowler, we may state with less reserve, that He is a person of a remarkably shrewd intellect,—a Scholar of considerable attainments,—deeply versed in the details of Masonic ceremonies, and mysteries, to the study of which he has devoted a great part of his life, and into which, he is supposed to have introduced many innovations, and inventions of his own,—a contemporary also, and co-partner with the late Mr. Zimmerman, in those transactions, which took place about the year 1798, and which afterwards led to the formation of Mr. Fowler's Chapter by himself,—in the beginning of the present century,—out of which Chapter alone, without the co-operation of any other Chapter, or person, in existence, the Council of Rites was at a still later period formed,—about the year 1836. Mr. Fowler is the founder of the Council of

Rites,—that body being, only under a different name, and with some newer pretensions and assumptions, the identical Chapter just mentioned, of which, Mr. Fowler was the origin,—and of which he has been for nearly 50 years,—i. e., during the whole term of its existence under different names and phases,—the great and recognised champion.

The letters, therefore, which passed between these persons, and which are now laid before the Free-Masonic public, are deserving of the most careful perusal by every member of the craft in Ireland, almost every one of whom is now called upon to take part with one side or the other,—and all of whom are, therefore, imperatively bound to investigate, to consider, and to examine with the utmost scrutiny, what *really are facts*—and what are falsifications,—in a case, where neutrality is hardly possible, nor certainly could be justified upon any reputable plea. For, as every member of the Free-Masonic community is bound to aid in the removal of these dissensions, and in the just, and fair, and equitable settlement of those opposing claims, the competition of which now threatens the destruction of all fraternal ties,—and which are the disgrace of Irish Masonry at the present day,—so it is necessary that all should be informed of the true nature, and causes, of these disputes,—of the mode in which they are, and have been, conducted upon each side,—and of the evidence which each has adduced in support of the statements made by it in its own behalf, or in contradiction of those put forward by its opponent. We think that the letters now published cannot fail to make a strong impression, containing, as they do, the allegations of Mr. O'Connor upon the one side, and of Mr. Fowler upon the other, of the latter of whom, especially, it may be said,

*“ Si Pergama dextrā defendi possunt,  
Etiam h̄c defensa fuissent.”*

Indeed Mr. Fowler's letter of the 12th July, 1844, together with the documents which it encloses, and which are now published, contains the whole case of the Council of Rites, made out with great deliberation, and after the subject had been under the consideration of the writer, for nearly 50 years,—and to that letter, we think,—indeed *we are sure*, and *know*, that Mr. O'Connor's letter furnishes an extinguishing and complete reply. But we do not wish the Free-Masonic public to take our word for this;—we wish them to judge for themselves,—to form, fearlessly, yet cautiously, their own unbiased and impartial opinions,—and to *act* accordingly.

*January, 1845.*

## A FEW MORE WORDS.

---

39, Dorset-street, Upper, Dublin.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

From information which I have received from Brother Malachi Fitzpatrick, Brother Fannin, and others, I understand that you have stated—

1st—That, at the Meeting of the Committees, of the Grand Chapter, and of the Council of Rites, in 1840, the latter produced their Books, and shewed where JOHN PEREE, whom you designated as the head or founder of the Grand Chapter, was initiated as a Prince Mason in the Chapter called the “*Original*” Chapter ; conceiving that his initiation in the Grand Chapter was not sufficiently authentic.

2ndly—That an amicable arrangement was put out of the question, by an unconditional and unqualified refusal, on the part of the Grand Chapter, to produce or give any evidence of title, or to exhibit any of its documents or records.

3rdly—That the Council of Rites are the legal descendants of the primitive Chapter of Rose Croix, established in Dublin in 1782, or previously, under the appellation of the Kilwinning Chapter ; and that, in that year, S.P. Darling was installed Sovereign of it by one Laurent, a foreigner ; and that, five or six years after the above date, this Chapter gave a Warrant to Peree to form a new Chapter ; and that a minute or entry of this last mentioned proceeding stands recorded in the transaction books, now the property of the Council of Rites ; also, that the source, from which the Grand Chapter of the present day claims descent, is no other than the aforesaid Chapter of Peree, which you stated to have been formed by, and under the Warrant of, the said primitive Chapter of 1782.

Allow me to ask you, whether or not my informants have truly, and accurately, reported to me what you actually did state. If they have not done so, I would feel obliged by your pointing to any error, or inaccuracy. But if, on the contrary, you pronounce the above information to be correct, I shall still be most happy to receive any explanation, which may appear to you to be proper, or by which you may wish to amend, or qualify, those statements which you have made.

In making these inquiries, I am, I trust, influenced only by the

best and purest feelings, as a member of the Free-Masonic community, and by the most anxious desire to display every possible mark of courtesy towards yourself. Hoping, therefore, to be favored by a reply at your earliest convenience,

I remain, dear Sir and Brother,

Very fraternally yours,

July 5, 1844.

HENRY O'CONNOR.

To JOHN FOWLER, Esq.,  
Deputy Grand Secretary, and Past  
Deputy Grand Master, &c., &c.,  
of the Grand Lodge of Ireland.

Dorset-street, Upper.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

Allow me to remind you of my note,—which you received on Friday last, and in which I made it a special request, that, at your earliest convenience, you would favor me with your reply to the enquiries it contained.

Considering the circumstances of the case, you will not, I am sure, deem me impertunate in now expressing my anxiety, that you may, without inconvenience, be able, on the present occasion, to oblige me by an answer; and I trust that I am not deceived in my hopes, that your having abstained from answering that note more expeditiously, has not been occasioned by illness, or indisposition to afford me the means of tracing, to their source, statements, such as formed the subject of my application.

I am also satisfied that you will receive, with that courtesy in which it is tendered, my candid assurance, that there is no member, even of the Free-Masonic community, upon whom I would less wish to entail trouble, than upon yourself; whether concerning matters of etiquette, the reparation of injuries, or the explanation of mistakes; and none, therefore, upon whom I would, with more pain, feel myself obliged to fix the responsibility of being the originator of those statements and reports, which, as I understand, you have detailed.

Hoping, therefore, that should you be unable to disavow those statements altogether, you will kindly refer me to your authority for them,

I remain, dear Sir and Brother,

Yours &c.,

HENRY O'CONNOR.

July 8, 1844.

P.S.—I hope this letter may reach your office to-day, before you have left it.



Commercial Buildings, 8th July, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

Although I received your note of the 5th instant, on Friday last, I have not been able to answer it yet, from extreme hurry of business, but, in two or three days I will do so, and I trust, to your satisfaction.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours fraternally,

J. FOWLER.

HENRY O'CONNOR, Esq.,  
39, Upper Dorset-street.

12th July, 1844, 30, Denzille-street.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

I received your courteous and fraternal note of the 8th, and hasten, amidst the hurry of business, an equally courteous and fraternal reply. The Brethren, to whom your note refers, were probably present on a recent occasion in the Grand Lodge, when I was afforded an opportunity of publicly stating what occurred at the conference, between Brothers R. M'Causland and Copinger, having possession of the Transaction-Book of Peree's Chapter, on the one hand,—and Brothers Norman, White, and myself, having in our possession the Book of the Original Chapter, on the other hand,—on which occasion I stated, that our conference was held on two distinct days. On the first day, Brothers M'Causland and Copinger did not bring their Book, but we amicably talked over the preliminaries; but as Brother Copinger wished our conference to be conducted as if it had taken place prior to the establishment of the Council of Rites in 1836, I informed him we were not so instructed by our constituents, but that we would consult the Council of Rites before our next meeting, and take their instructions; which we did, and received from them a written document, (of which I have obtained a copy, which I here transcribe.)

“ It having been reported to us, that the Chapter of Prince Masons, of which Brother John Peree was the first Sovereign, on or about the year 1790, and the succeeding years, is still in existence,

“ Resolved—That if said Chapter do still exist, by having a regular succession of Sovereigns lawfully appointed and installed, and empowered, according to ancient usage, under the hand and seal of a lawfully installed predecessor—said facts to be proved to our satisfaction, by an inspection of their Books—and that the Sovereign and Members shall memorial us for a Warrant, that we will most cheerfully recommend to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, our most illustrious Grand President, to sign such Warrant in the usual form, without expense.”

During the course of our discussion of some of the points

under consideration, when I urged that the nature of the institution required the powers of the Chair to be conferred only by those who had been themselves installed, insomuch that any number of Master Masons, if unassisted by present or past Masters of Lodges, could not instal a new Master in the Chair,—Brother Copinger agreed so fully with me on that head, that he confirmed my opinion, with the remark, that forty “Priests could not make a Bishop.” However, on the production of the before-mentioned document from the Council of Rites, he declared that he would never acknowledge the Council of Rites;—and thus he put an end to the conference.

During the whole time the conference lasted, Brother Copinger never opened a parcel (which I believe to be the Transaction Book of Peree’s Chapter,) which he held under his arm. I then said to him, “Brother Copinger” you have broken up the conference without showing your Book, and, therefore, I am not obliged to shew mine, but I will volunteer to do so; and I thereupon turned to the record of the initiation of Brother John Peree into the mysteries of Prince Masonry in the Original, and caused Brother M’Causland, who sat next to me, to read the same,—Brother Copinger sitting next to him, and Brothers White and Norman, in all five persons, round a table so small that every one present must have been fully cognisant of the proceeding. With the knowledge of this termination of the conference on my mind, you may judge of my astonishment, on finding, a short time after what purported to be an account of that conference in the Newspapers, in which it was said, that they, Brothers M’Causland and Copinger, proposed to produce all their records and muniments, provided we would, in like manner, produce ours, but that, from “this honest and manly” course of arrangement, we, the Delegates of the Council of Rites, shrank with conscious weakness. With such an open disregard for truth published in the Newspapers, and afterwards several times re-printed in an anonymous pamphlet, I declared indignantly, in the Grand Lodge, that I so heartily despised such a system of conduct, that I would never again condescend to any future conference.

The foregoing is the purport of the statement I made in the Grand Lodge, and which I now repeat; only that I omitted to say, that I appealed to Brothers Norman and White, for a verification of my statement.

I now come to what I did not say:—I never asserted that Brother J. Peree was initiated in the Original Chapter, as “*conceiving that his initiation in another Chapter was not sufficiently authentic*;” for, if I had said so, it would not have been the truth. What I always said, *and do say*, is, that Brother Peree was initiated, not reinitiated, into the mysteries of Prince Masonry, in the Original Chapter; for it appears by our book, that he also received, from the same persons, the previous degree of High Knight Templar. Now, having such documents in my possession, I could not, and I did not, ever assert, that he, Brother John Peree, was first made Prince Mason elsewhere, and afterwards re-made by the Original Chapter.

Again, I never asserted that Peree's Chapter had or held a Warrant from the original Chapter; but I did say, that Peree's Chapter grew out of the Original Chapter, thus:—when Brother J. Peree was succeeded in the office of Deputy Grand Master by Dr. Wade, who had also received the degree of Rose Croix in the Original Chapter, Brother E. Zimmerman, the intimate friend of Brother Peree, installed him Sovereign over a second Chapter, consisting of such members of Lodge 198, (to which Lodge both Peree and Wade belonged,) as had obtained the rank of Prince Masons in the Original Chapter. Now this second Chapter (which I here call Peree's Chapter) was always recognised by the Original Chapter, out of respect to its founder, Zimmerman, who was present in, and assisted at, the first establishment of the Rose Croix here by Brother Laurent in 1782; and continued to work, with both Chapters, as a foreign Mason of high attainments. As a proof of our recognition of Peree's Chapter, so long as it existed, I, who had been initiated a Prince Mason in the Original Chapter, by Brothers E. Zimmerman, Sisson P. Darling, and John Rigby, visited this second (or Peree's) Chapter, when all the parties were living,—Brother Peree himself presiding.

With respect to the Council of Rites, it is not the descendant of any particular Lodge, or Chapter; it is a representative body, consisting of delegates from various high orders of Masonry, being established, like the Grand Encampment of Knights Templars, under the authority of his Grace the Duke of Leinster; and embracing, like the Grand Orient in France, the Rose Croix, and all the orders above it.

I have been thus explicit in my reply, because your letter and enquiries are couched in kind and brotherly language; and I have also procured an extract,—from the minutes of the Grand Council of Rites,—which I enclose.

I remain, Dear Sir and Brother,  
Yours fraternally,  
J. FOWLER.

HENRY O'CONNOR, Esq.

[The following are the minutes referred to in the above letter.]

9th day of May, 1840.

At an extraordinary meeting of the Supreme Grand Council of Rites for Ireland,

PRESENT, 21 MEMBERS.

Brother Sir John Fowler, Grand Chancellor, laid before the Council the Letter of His Grace the Grand President, dated the 4th instant, and the Memorial therein referred to, which were as follows, viz.:—

“ Carton, Maynooth, 4th May, 1840.

“ MY DEAR BROTHER FOWLER,

“ Brother M'Causland, one of the Brethren who have assumed the title of Prince Masons, called on me, and,

although not authorised to do so, I think, from the conversation I had with him, some good may result. Their idea is, that Brother Zimmerman was expelled their Chapter, and then formed ours. I said, that you had documents in your possession, which would convince any man of our originality. They seem to be brought to their senses, by the resolution of the Supreme Grand Council of Rites for Ireland, and may follow a suggestion of mine, that a Committee of three members of our Chapter should meet three of theirs.

" That the books, and other documents, be produced and fairly examined.

" That they shoud take out a Warrant from the Supreme Grand Council of Rites.

" That we should send Members of our Chapter to see how they worked, and show them, so as to have a uniformity of working.

" I propose the following Brethren be appointed the Committee:—

" Brothers JOHN NORMAN,  
" JOHN FOWLER,  
" WILLIAM WHITE.

" If this idea meet the wishes of the other Members of the Supreme Grand Council of Rites, I think this unpleasant matter may be settled.

" If they have any Members under age, a dispensation may be granted to them. I am sorry I am going to London, or would with pleasure attend to this.

" Yours very sincerely,

" LEINSTER.

" To Brother JOHN FOWLER, &c."

This Letter conveyed the following communication, which was laid before the Supreme Grand Council.

" TO HIS GRACE AUGUSTUS FREDERICK DUKE OF LEINSTER  
GRAND MASTER OF FREEMASONS IN IRELAND, &c., &c.

" *The humble Memorial of the undersigned, on behalf of themselves and other Members of the Grand Chapter of Prince Masons in Ireland,*

" SHEWETH,

" That the undersigned have seen with great pain, a Manifesto prepared by a Committee of the Grand Council of Rites for Ireland, signed by your Grace as Grand President of the Council, and Grand Inspector General of Masons in Ireland, in which it is stated, ' That certain individuals have recently assumed the title of Prince Masons, disclaiming the Authority of His Grace the Duke of Leinster, Supreme Head of all the Masonic Degrees in Ireland.'

" The undersigned beg most emphatically and distinctly to deny, that they, or any of the Members of the Chapter, have ever disclaimed the authority of your Grace, or that they ever contemplated such a measure: on the contrary, the undersigned beg leave

to assure your Grace, that the Grand Chapter of Prince Masons in Ireland, to which they have the honor to belong, has regularly (although with intermissions) continued its workings for more than half a century ; and that at the last meeting of the Chapter, on the 27th ult., the undersigned were appointed a Committee for the purpose of communicating with your Grace, and of disabusing your Grace's mind of the unjust imputation cast upon the Chapter, by the Manifesto of the Grand Council of Rites, and to adopt such measures as should be deemed proper for the purpose of placing your Grace at the head of the Chapter, and of having its meetings under the immediate superintendence of your Grace.

" The undersigned cannot avoid expressing their regret, that the Manifesto of the Grand Council of Rites should have been prepared without any Notice to, or communication with, the Members of the Grand Chapter ; and that a Document, having the injurious tendency, to spread dissension and disunion amongst Members of the higher degrees of the Masonic Order in Ireland, should have been promulgated under the sanction of your Grace's authority.

" HERCULES ELLIS, M. W. S. & P. M. 50.

" CHRISTOPHER COPPINGER, P. M. 50.

" R. B. M'CAUSLAND, M. M. 50."

Brother Fowler having laid before the Grand Council of Rites the two communications of His Grace the Duke of Leinster on the subject of Brother R. M'Causland's conference with his Grace, and respecting claims of certain Brothers calling themselves Prince Masons, and designating themselves as Members of the Grand Chapter of Prince Masons ;

In accordance with His Grace's wishes, that the said Brethren should be convinced of their error, by Brother Fowler exhibiting the documents then in his possession, and comparing them with a Book of Transactions of a Chapter of Prince Masons, which has fallen into their hands, of which the late Brother John Peree was the first Sovereign, the said Council of Rites did accordingly authorize Brothers John Norman, William White, and John Fowler, to meet, as private Gentlemen only, three Members, or Delegates, from those Brothers, who have so called themselves, but without in any manner recognising them as such, but simply to convince them, from documentary evidence, and a comparison of our records with the Transaction-Book now in their possession, that Brother John Peree, having been initiated in the Original (Kilwinning) Chapter of Prince Masons, and that the Chapter, over which said Brother Peree did afterwards preside, having been formed subsequent to the introduction of the Order amongst the Members of the original (Kilwinning) Chapter, it could not, of course, be the original, but a second, as it was always allowed to be.

Accordingly, a conference took place, Brothers Copinger, and M'Causland, attending on the one part ; and Brothers Norman, White, and Fowler, on the other. In this meeting, the subject was calmly talked over ; but Brothers Copinger and M'Causland, not having brought the Transaction book of Brother Peree's

## A FEW MORE WORDS.

Chapter, no comparison of documents took place, although Brother Fowler had in the room those of the original Chapter. However, this preliminary conversation elicited their expectation to be met and recognised as Prince Masons, and gave room to Brother Fowler to state, on the part of the Council of Rites, that they were not authorised to recognize or meet them in any capacity but as private Gentlemen, possessed of certain documents, which it was deemed expedient should be mutually known to each other. Brothers Copinger and M'Causland stated, that they were not aware we were appointed by the Council of Rites; and we terminated the sitting, by saying, we would apply for further instructions from our constituents, particularly as they wished our conversation to be continued, as if no such body as the Council of Rites was in existence; or, to use their own phrase, as if in the year 1826, before such Council was constituted.

The Grand Council of Rites, having been a second time assembled, the Delegates communicated to them the above mentioned circumstances, when the following Resolution was passed unanimously, viz. :—

“ It having been reported to us, that the Chapter of Prince Masons, of which Brother John Perce was the first Sovereign, on or about the year 1790, and the succeeding years, is still in existence,

## “ RESOLVED,

“ That if said Chapter do still exist, by having a regular succession of Sovereigns lawfully appointed and installed, and empowered, according to ancient usage, under the hand and seal of a lawfully installed predecessor—said facts to be fully proved to our satisfaction by an inspection of their Books—and that the Sovereign and Members shall memorial us for a Warrant, that we will most cheerfully recommend to his Grace the Duke of Leinster, our most Illustrious Grand President, to sign such Warrant in the usual form, without expense.”

Furnished with this document, the Delegates met again, when Brother Copinger distinctly waived the claim of originality for Perce's Chapter, saying “ the unimportant matter of a few years priority of existence, was not worth contending for.” Having failed in establishing the existence of Perce's Chapter, which they had set forth as “ having existed so long, and was still in existence,”—having thus failed, by not producing any documents, he then attempted to have the Wicklow-street Association sanctioned. This was at once refused. He further stated, that Brother Richard M'Causland and he were intrusted with full power by those whom they represented, and that he had the Book of Transactions then in his possession, which, however, he did not shew or produce to us, retaining it as a parcel, wrapped up in paper, in his own hands.

Upon reading the above resolution from the Council of Rites, a copy of which we handed them, they declined proving to us from the exhibition of the Books, that Brother Perce's Chapter was then in existence, and the conference after having had two meetings, broke up without coming to any understanding, other

## A FEW MORE WORDS.

9

than that Brother Copinger's friends would not acknowledge the Council of Rites, to which they were referred by the Duke of Leinster.

In talking of the installation of the Sovereign, Brother Fowler said it was indispensable, as in the Blue Lodges, that a Sovereign or Master should install his successor; which Brother Copinger observed on, by saying, similar to the consecration of a Bishop,—for though there be forty Priests present, they cannot constitute him a Bishop, nor is he so, until the Bishop lays hands on him.

---

Dorset-street, Upper.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

I write merely for form sake, and very hastily, to acknowledge the receipt of your reply, and to thank you, as well for the trouble you have taken, as for your acknowledgment of the proper terms in which I addressed you. I am preparing to leave town on business of importance during the course of this week; and will be then, and in the mean time, so much occupied, that, until my return, I shall not be able (as I had expected) to give to your letter that answer, which it seems to me absolutely to require.

I am, dear Sir and Brother,

Yours fraternally,

HENRY O'CONNOR.

To JOHN FOWLER, Esq.

July 14th, 1844.

P.S.—I would have acknowledged its receipt on Saturday last, but that I hoped to have been able, this day, to have written more at length upon the subject, than circumstances will, for the present, permit.

---

Salisbury-street, Strand, London.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,

Although my having delayed, for such a length of time, to answer your letter, otherwise than by a short note of acknowledgment, can, I am sure, have occasioned you no inconvenience, yet I am anxious to assure you, in the first place, that my silence has not proceeded from neglect of your obliging communication, upon which I have rather bestowed a mark of my consideration, by having made it the companion of my journey.

Neither was it that your letter suggested any difficulty, which I did not feel myself competent to solve, upon the very day when your communication arrived; for the subject, as you are aware, was not then new to me, nor did I find, among all your arguments, one single allegation, for which the Grand Chapter could be unprepared. We had long before cracked every "nut," which the Council of Rites, or its advocates, could offer; and it is no censure upon your ingenuity, to say, that, at the late period when our corres-

pondence commenced, and when the kernel of every debatable point had been disposed of, you could produce nothing but empty husks, as the amount of your store. To adopt another metaphor, I may say, that your ammunition necessarily consisted—as for the future it must consist—of mere blank cartridge, with which, no doubt, a good deal of noise may be made, and perhaps some showy *œuvres* of pyrotechny be exhibited, to the terror, I dare say, of spiritless individuals, whose adhesion to our cause we do not care to obtain; but to the amusement of all rational and experienced observers. The bullets, of which your militant Chapter had, at one time, a considerable stock, had all been previously discharged,—some of which, indeed, have been productive of annoyance to us, effecting individual injury, and occasioning temporary disorder in our ranks, though each of these successive volleys always produced a reaction, which was, for the time, sufficient to silence our adversaries' guns. And, when you lately came forward at the sound of our trumpet,—You, the Ulysses of the Council,—to turn back the battle, you found yourself, in all but strategy, and courage, destitute of every means of defence, or contest;—*there was not a shot in your locker.*

Upon perusing your letter, however, I found, that although it was easy to answer every point to which it alluded, my reply must necessarily be long;—and therefore, I deferred, until a day of unbroken leisure, that which, I knew, would require a full day to perform.

You will remember that my letter of the 5th ultimo contained *three* enquiries, respecting the subject upon which you have obligingly declared your willingness to afford me satisfactory information. Let me request that you will now look back to that letter, and fix those three questions in your mind; as the whole of this letter will have reference thereto, though I may, perhaps, not find it convenient to deal with them in consecutive order.

I am happy to find, that you disavow, and indeed, contradict, the assertion, that the celebrated John Peree,—entertaining doubts of the legitimacy of the Grand Chapter (to which he belonged) abandoned it, and submitted to a re-initiation under your auspices. It appears, *inter alia*, from our records, that the said Peree, on the 25th March, 1799, presided, in person, and for the last time, at a meeting of the Grand Chapter. This was less than three months before his death, which, on the third day of June following, was announced to the order, as “the death of our most wise and beloved Sovereign.” And from the balance-sheet of accounts and expenditure at the end of the then current half-year, it appears, that his funeral was attended by the members of the Grand Chapter, attired in mourning, and Masonic costume, the expences of which attendance, &c., were defrayed out of our funds.

I am, therefore, rejoiced that *this statement* (at least) has not received your sanction, either (as you say) “in the Grand Lodge” or *out of it*; and I only regret, that, either *there* or *elsewhere* (for the *venue* is altogether unimportant) other material statements have been made by you, which, I am bound to assure you,—and to *prove* to you,—are equally erroneous. But, before I proceed

to these, I will, with your permission, make two very brief commentaries, respecting what I have said above.

First—With respect to the day above-mentioned—the 25th of March, 1799.—that I mean to shew, was a remarkable day. In your letter to me, you assert that Peree's Chapter, so long as it existed, was recognized by the "Original" Chapter, to which you belong. And, in proof of this recognition, you urge, that you, after having been initiated by S. P. Darling, Zimmerman, and Rigby, visited this second, or Peree's Chapter; Br. Peree himself presiding. Now, it does appear, that your recollection of having visited the G. C., when Peree was in the Chair, is so far borne out by our minutes, that, among the list of persons attending on that day, the following entry, which I copy *verbatim*, occurs:—

" FOWLER, Visiter."

No Christian name is given, (contrary to the invariable system pursued all through our books.) No reference is made to the Chapter, to which that Brother Fowler belonged. But, I take it, that you must have been the party there named—because you state that you visited us, and I find that the name of Fowler does not occur in any other part of our minutes, extending (as those *extant* do) over a period of more than 60 years. How, or by whose means, you gained admission, it might not appear to you expedient to state; nor have I any right, or wish, to enquire. Probably you were "vouched" by Sisson P. Darling, who officiated upon that occasion as S. Grand Warden, and who, you say,† was one of the parties, by whom you were initiated into the degree of Rose Croix. Now, there are more reasons than one for supposing, that the Sovereign, Peree, was then very ill; and for suspecting, that, (therefore, perhaps,) the business of the Chapter was conducted in rather a careless and slovenly manner, on that evening. This may serve to explain the admission of an unqualified person, to whom a *portion* of our mysteries had been communicated. At all events, it is a remarkable coincidence, that, in exactly eight months afterwards, to wit, upon Monday, the 25th of November, in the same year (1799) and so soon after the Sovereign, one of the most experienced, zealous, and influential members of the Grand Chapter, had ceased to exist, the following entry appears:—

The Chapter having been informed, that two of its members knew of, or were concerned in, the intended formation of another Chapter of Prince Masons, without any communication with this Chapter, proceeded to consider same, and, after some time spent in so doing, the further consideration was adjourned till this day se'night."

From the transactions of that Adjourned Meeting, which accordingly, was held upon the 2d of December, it appears distinctly who these two members were, viz.: Zimmerman and Darling,—the same who had thus initiated you into Prince Masonry, in an irregular manner,—but who had waited for

\* Vide p. (5) ante—line (18).

† Ibid ante.

convenient season for throwing off the mask. To Zimmerman, of whom I intend to speak more fully before I conclude, the death of Peree seemed to offer a suitable occasion. There is some reason for supposing, that that adventurer had been long the object of some degree of suspicion; and, at all events, it is certain, that, from being a most constant attendant at the meetings of the Grand Chapter, he had suddenly discontinued his presence at its assemblies; and, for some years previous to the date above mentioned, had absented himself altogether.

Darling, however, was, as I am informed, a gentleman of character and respectability, although he had been, *for a very short time*, misled by the artifices of his unprincipled colleague, to bear a part in his scandalous proceedings. Zimmerman, indeed, has always been considered by the Grand Chapter as, at that time, the Alpha and Omega,—the head and the tail,—of this discreditable project, which led to his well-merited expulsion in the year 1800; while Darling, whose participation in the plot appears to have been temporary, and who, it seems, upon being convinced of its criminality, at once abandoned it, was permitted to resign without censure, and even, frequently afterwards, to visit the Grand Chapter on friendly terms.

I say, then, that when Peree died, Zimmerman no longer thought it necessary to make a secret of his proceedings. The *materiel*, of which the Grand Chapter was composed, not suiting the purposes which he appears to have had in view, he accordingly sought his quarry elsewhere,—amongst the youthful, ardent, imaginative, and confiding. For a while he worked, secretly and silently, beneath the surface,—yet cunningly and with effect. I am inclined to believe, that it was during this vermicular state, and, consequently, *before* his expulsion (*valeat quantum the concession*) that he initiated *you*,—perhaps in the beginning of the year 1797, or even in 1796, when he deemed it expedient to discontinue his constant attendances upon the Grand Chapter. Of course, so far as the date of your initiation is concerned, I only speak from conjecture; and I believe, that the date, or even the reality, either of that event, or of your installation to the chair, in the Rose Croix degree, can be known only from your own statements, and recollection. (I understand, indeed, that you hold a diploma from Emmanuel Zimmerman, but that you deny that it has any reference to your *initiation*, but only to your *installation* into the chair: in point of fact, that diploma is manifestly of no value whatever; but it is not necessary to enter upon a discussion of its merits now, if I am rightly informed, that you yourself have declared it to refer to your installation as *M. W. Sovereign*, and not to your first initiation into the Rose Croix). Therefore, I say, that I believe your *initiation*, at least, can be proved only by your own assertions. In the first place, I know that you have been requested to produce, in any genuine Masonic book, the entry or minute thereof, and that you assigned, as an excuse for not doing so, that the *book was not at hand!*; although the place where you were asked so to do, by Brother Thomas Snowe, in the presence of others, was your public office, where

I believe, you keep all these sort of things, and where you, at the same time, did produce a book, which you stated to be one of the books of your Chapter. I have no right to call upon you to produce such records, yet I feel assured that you will not allow me the privilege of inspecting them.

In the second place, your letter to me maintains a Pythagorean silence upon this important point; though, as you were not initiated as an entered apprentice in Craft Masonry until 1792, you may suppose that I felt some curiosity to know how far the usual practice,—then more strictly observed than it had been in later times,—of giving the superior degrees only to experienced persons, and not to very young men, of only 2, 3, or 4 years standing in the order, was dispensed with in your case.

And thirdly, (as I am informed by Brother Fitzpatrick and others, and as my own knowledge of the facts in a great degree confirms,) the period, which your Rose Croix escutcheon, hung up for display in the Grand Lodge-rooms, assigns to this important event, has been so frequently altered, amended, and erased, and at present appears in such an obliterated condition, that no dependence whatever, can be placed upon its testimony. Now, to return to Zimmerman; I say, that, his designs being such as I have described, it is not at all surprising, that a young gentleman of talent and promise, [at that time, I believe, the Principal of a Seminary,] should have been marked out, as you were, for his peculiar and especial prey; nor do I suppose, that you can feel greatly ashamed of having been made, at that early period of life, when you were only two or three years a member of the Free-Masonic community, the victim of an imposition, which would have deceived men better versed in masonic polity, and more experienced in the world. But I aver, that he initiated you privately; and that he was aware of the infamy of his conduct in so doing, in violation of his solemn pledge; and I say also, that it was not until he had scraped together a few adherents, that he ventured to shew his nose above ground. But, when Peree died, then Zimmerman, at the head of his secret or *esoteric* society, wriggled himself upwards,—assumed the colours of the butterfly,—*was instantly renounced by Darling*,\* whom alone, of all the members of the Grand Chapter, he had been able to delude; and was most justly expelled by the Prince Masons of Ireland.

Therefore, when you visited our Chapter, I presume that you came from a laudable anxiety to see, practically, what that was, of which you had learned something from the conversations of Zimmerman. You came, too, probably under the patronage of S. P. Darling, who, however, I have reason to say, would not recognise you afterwards. For when, in 1806, you thought fit to compliment Doctor Dalcho, and asked from him permission to re-publish, in

\* The records of the Grand Chapter afford strong confirmation of this assertion, of which the refutation must be, to you, an easy task, if the above assertion be not correct. You have but to produce your books.

*Ireland*, his work,—(which, I think, was published in America, and therefore, was public property when it came over here,) you published, in the re-print of that person's book, a list of the members of your Chapter of Prince Masons, in which List the name of Darling does not appear; though, in that year, and in the preceding and subsequent years, the same S. P. Darling was in the habit of attending the meetings of the Grand Chapter. Have I not reason then to affirm, that Darling did not, after the *expose* had take place, recognize you in any manner, even by visiting the new Chapter to which you belonged, and in the formation of which, it seems, he had partially assisted, though to what extent, it is not easy to ascertain. If, after Zimmerman's degradation, Darling had, by any act, recognised either you, or your Chapter, the act was one of gross fraud towards the Grand Chapter of Ireland, which, when it expelled Zimmerman, the ring-leader, for contumacy, gave amnesty to his follower, Darling, upon his recantation. But, at all events, Darling was not a member of your body, as appears from your list, in 1806,—which he would have been, and would have made it a point to be, had not the fact been as I have stated, viz.:—that he saw his error—confessed it,—promised that he would abandon the conspiracy into which he had been betrayed,—and was, accordingly, by us absolved.\*

This is the chief part of what I intended to say, in reference to your visit to the Grand Chapter in 1799. RECOLLECT, you never came again,—it was your first, and only, appearance among the regular Prince Masons of the country, and, from that day to this, during five-and-forty years, neither you, nor any single

\* Among the circumstances attending the rise and progress of the "Original" Chapter, your reprint of Dalcho's book deserves to be noticed. That Empiric appears to have had a hand in cooking up the *meas* of the said "Original." Compliments from it to him, and, I believe, *vice versa*, were transmitted across the wide Atlantic, you not being at the time aware that he was an impostor, who pretended to have full powers from the King of Prussia, but who himself instituted these powers. This appears from Clavel's *Histoire pittoresque*, p. 206, (et passim.) After the pains that you took to recommend yourselves to the Doctor, it is not probable that he could be so ungrateful as to refuse his patronage, and assistance, to the little farce that was enacting in Dublin. He, on the one hand, and your Chapter upon the other, were each willing to give and receive mutual assistance—both were *in consimili casu*—the only difference being, that his part happened to be cast in a larger, but not more legitimate drama, than your own.

Observe, however, that I do not attribute to you, *personally*, intentions similar to those of which he stands convicted; any more than I would ascribe to your pen (though purporting to be by T.M.W.S.J.F., which some WAG might interpret The Most Wise Sovereign, John Fowler,) the authorship of that Tavern-ode, which, (with the music annexed, and concluding with the chorus of "which nobody can deny,") appears to this day, upon the subject of the "Original Chapter of Princes" and soforth— appended to the volume of "Orations" (bless the mark) of Doctor Frederic Dalcho—not Frederic the Great, by whom he pretended to have been commissioned; but Frederic the little.

member of your Chapter, was ever so good as to recognize "the Chapter of Peree!" You cannot say, that we, the Chapter of Peree, ceased to exist soon after; for our old minutes prove that the said "Chapter of Peree" was never more flourishing than it was for **FIFTEEN** years next after the period above named. And why was this? Why did you not *afterwards* come, even **ONCE**, to see your friends? Why did not you, or any member of the "Original" Chapter, ever come *before*? The plain answer to these questions is, that your Chapter had no existence previously; and that, the moment it was heard of, the bubble burst. Neither you, nor any of your Chapter, *could* have visited us previous to the *dénouement*, had you avowed yourselves of a Chapter, which, at its birth, we, the Chapter of Peree, declared to be spurious; nor could any of you have afterwards passed our porch without due enquiry, as it appears *you* did, when Peree, half-dead, occupied the Chair, and just eight months before the "formation of another Chapter" was suspected.

Your allusion to this matter, in your letter, I must say, has been made with great tact, and ability. You say, the circumstance, of your having visited us, proves that the Chapter of Peree was recognized by yours in 1799. As I could not imagine that you felt any great partiality for "the Chapter of Peree," I was rather struck by the circumstance of your volunteering to give evidence, which, you were pleased to say, would confirm its title; and, on examination, I found, what I think I have now shewn, that the evidence which you proffer—namely, the circumstance of your having visited that Chapter on a single remarkable occasion,—did not at all lead to the inference, that we, the Chapter of Peree, were recognized by yours. Such an inference, *nothing could or ever can prove*; because the two Chapters have been ever at variance since the acknowledgment of the birth of yours,—then a clandestine babe of a few months old,—in 1799. But I found also, that this allegation of "the visit" might *prima facie* seem to imply, **THAT YOU WERE AT ONE TIME RECOGNIZED BY THE GRAND CHAPTER.** Thus you would have two strings to your bow—a good and a bad one—and I am very sorry, that, of the former, I am obliged to deprive you;—for you have never been recognized by the Chapter of Peree, or by its successors, *save once in mistake*. This is the plain unvarnished truth; and so far as you, personally, are concerned, I regret much, that the irregularity of your initiation, and the infamy of Zimmerman, left us no option, or other course, to pursue.

I promised that my two commentaries would be brief, but the first has carried me into a long career. I shall, however, use my best exertions to condense the second, which relates to the use of the Title which we assume, viz.: that of the **GRAND CHAPTER OF IRELAND.**

I would not allude to this point, but that I have frequently heard and read the insinuation, that we have recently usurped that name. Nor would I, in general, give much heed to an idle report, emanating from no body knows whom; but I now observe,

that in your communication, you never, EVER ONCE, give it the name it is entitled to, and by which it is popularly called and known, but, several times, call it PEREE'S CHAPTER—a name which it does not assume—one by which it is not usually denominated among Freemasons,—and which it has no better right to bear, than it has to be called the Chapter of Ellis—of Martin—or of MacDona—all of whom were Sovereigns in their day, as Mr. Poree was in his. You go out of your way to give us this nick-name, which, having once for all protested against it, *so far as it may contain an insinuation, that Poree was the founder* of the Chapter, to which you prefix his name, I shall pass without further observation or complaint—“The Rose by any other name will smell as sweet.” Nor shall I refuse to the Chapter of Zimmerman (on the present occasion) the title of “Grand Council of Rites”—I will even add the word SUPREME, by way of compliment to my correspondent; for the converse of the proposition, concerning the Rose, is also true; and *that* which hath specifically an unpleasant and unwholesome odour, cannot be altered, or rendered salutary, by words and names; nor made to smell savorily in the public nostrils, by means of any sounds, however musical, which may accompany it.

I wish, however, to assure you, that on the day on which you visited our Chapter, the minutes state that the “Grand Chapter closed, &c.,” which name, as appears from our minutes, it had then borne for many years,—unquestioned,—for there was no other Chapter of Rose Croix in existence in Ireland to demur,—and that name, together with the powers and authority of a Grand Chapter,—among which, one is the right of granting warrants,—it has ever since exercised, and preserved, without question or denial, save by the Supreme Grand Council of Rites for Ireland, &c., &c., which, whatever may be its title, has no other source, and as I shall show, before I conclude, is *no other*, than the “Original” Chapter that “originated” in 1799, from Emanuel Zimmerman, and which (I am sorry to say) is honored by your connection with it. I now return to your letter.

For your observations respecting the nature of installation to the chair of a Chapter of Rose Croix, I feel the more obliged, because they have been communicated to me from a desire, upon your part, to render your explanations even more than co-extensive with my enquiries. I must, however, remind you (for I am sure that it is not new information) that the best informed, and most distinguished members of the order, maintain a contrary opinion, holding, that the presence of an installed Sovereign is not requisite; and that any three members of the degree of Rose Croix, meeting together, can form a regular Chapter, and are amply competent to make an initiation, or any other act, that a Chapter of Prince Masons can perform, legitimate and valid, for all purposes whatsoever.

That the invention of peculiar mysteries and formalities, appertaining to what is called the degree of a *Sovereign Prince*, is a novelty, and a very recent one, in this country, is a doctrine on which I do not intend at present to descant. I shall merely

observe with respect to it, that this opinion appears to me to receive some confirmation from the circumstances under which, the mode in which, and the persons by or through whom, degrees and orders, "purporting to be masonic," and pretending to be ancient, regular, and of high institution, have, from time to time, been disseminated in Ireland. If we except the isolated case of the re-modelling, re-construction, or revival, of the order of Rose Croix, by Laurent and others, in or about the year 1782, by a deputation, or at least by some of the leading members, whether formally deputed or not, from a college then existing in London, but composed almost exclusively of foreigners,—with this exception,\* I think I would be able to produce satisfactory evidence, (and you assuredly could, by more than one example, illustrate the demonstration,) that all the acquisitions, which, for the last 60 or 70 years, have been received, to the existing stock of Irish masonry, have been imparted by adventurers; all of them, I believe, Jews,—rather unseemly apostles, one would suppose, of a system connected with Christianity,—none of them, I suspect, entirely disinterested,—and most of whom, certainly, disposed of their commodities at the most exorbitant profits,—individuals, to whom the term "*Charlatan*," is the mildest that can be applied.† This, I believe, was not always your own opinion, or the opinion of those, with whom, possibly, you may think proper to advise, touching the contents of this letter; but I do believe, that, at this day, no friendly prejudice, upon your part, towards the persons to whom I have alluded, can be wounded by the observations above made, otherwise I would either have suppressed them altogether, or would have reserved for a more suitable opportunity, and a more appropriate medium, than the present, that which I might consider it profitable to say. Nor would I forgive myself, if I thought, that, in the present communication, I had said more than was absolutely necessary for the purpose of communicating my ideas to my correspondent,—one of which ideas is, that the authority, from whom you have taken up your doctrines concerning installation, and the Rose Croix, *et cetera*, may POSSIBLY not prove the most deserving of your confidence, or of mine. I hope that, in my method of arguing this topic, I have succeeded in my earnest endeavour not to transgress any rule of legitimate reasoning, or go beyond the bounds of justifiable *παροήσια*.

From what I have above stated, it appears to me to follow, that, —unless we are to set ourselves against practice, almost universal, and to discard almost all reputable authority, in deference to

\* If even this case were altogether an exception.

† With the exception of England and Ireland, there is not, I believe, a country in the world, where your doctrine is practised, or even generally heard of. All over the Continent of Europe, from whence the degree originally came, every member of a Rose Croix Chapter is called a *Sovereign Prince*. In America, also, I understand, this to be the case; and I positively assert, that the whole business of these Chair-Secrets, &c., is a corruption, recently invented in England or Ireland, and no where else practised, or known, over the whole world.

the blunders of the Council of Rites, and to the doctrines of those reckless impostors, in whom you reposed your confidence.—the argument which, you say, you urged to Brother Copinger, at the meeting of the Committee, in 1840, must be deemed erroneous ; though it is better that you did bring it forward ;—because your having done so, afforded to Brother Copinger the opportunity of showing you, by his observation respecting the forty Priests, that he was disposed, for the purpose of peace, and *pro re nata*, to adopt your own doctrines, and fully prepared to shew, that his Chapter was not (nor is it) assailable, even under the rules, which you had yourself imposed.

I now come to the subject of the **PRODUCTION OF TITLE**,—upon which (under your favor be it spoken) your letter appears to me to require much commentary, in order to the full elucidation of facts.

You have not denied, and, I presume, do not mean to deny, that, previous to the production of the resolution of the Grand Council of Rites, it had been freely offered on the part of the Grand Chapter, and fully understood by you, that our delegates would produce their title, provided the Council of Rites would, in like manner, produce theirs, and agree, that the titles, so produced on both sides, should be conclusive upon the parties. Without some such understanding as this, it is inconceivable for what purpose a further day could have been appointed for conference, and it is preposterous to suppose, that your delegates would have assented to another interview, had you not expected to see our title thereat.—Nor do I suppose that you will accuse Brother Copinger of being capable of the dishonest, and foolish mockery, of ostentatiously bringing with him a parcel, that was, on no account, and under no circumstances, to be opened : moreover, in your letter to me, you distinctly assert, that it was “ upon production of the before-mentioned document from the Council of Rites,” that he (Mr. Copinger) declared he would never acknowledge the Council of Rites, and **THUS**,—that is, in consequence of the unreasonable conduct of the Council of Rites, — he put an end to the conference. You then, it seems, proceeded to address Brother Copinger, and said to him, that he “had broken up the conference without producing his title ; but, that you would volunteer to shew yours ;” and your letter further states, that you did, thereupon, produce the minute concerning the initiation of John Perez. But you do not, and **CANNOT** say, that you offered a *general inspection* of title, either at that stage of the proceeding, or previously, or afterwards, or on any occasion ;—without which, surely, you must have entertained a poor opinion of Brother Copinger’s capacity, if you thought that he could be satisfied by the perusal of but one isolated entry, which it was deemed *convenient* to disclose. And I presume, that, in saying to Brother Copinger, or in now repeating that you said, “ Brother Copinger, you have broken up the conference *without producing your title* ;” you did not then, and do not now, mean to insinuate, that it was *because* of such non-production by us, that the conference was put an end to ;—for, you have distinctly told me, that it was *on the production*

by you of the monstrous resolution passed by the Council of Rites, that Brother Copinger declared he would not recognise that body,—and you expressly affirm “such” to have been the mode, and the occasion, of the conference being put an end to.

And how could it be expected, that any man, being in the possession of his senses, would accept of such terms from an adverse party? That we should commence enquiries, by admitting the whole case of those adversaries *versus* ourselves,—and proceed with an arrangement for peace, and for the settlement of mutual claims, by practically acknowledging that we had no claims at all, or at least, that our claims were of a very subordinate description, and altogether dependent upon the mercy, and favour, of the Grand Council of Rites; which absurdity was to be crowned by our prostrating ourselves before our opponents, and on our bended knees imploring for a warrant, from a conclave which we considered wholly illegal! Read again this resolution of the Council of Rites, and say if I am misrepresenting, in the least degree, its meaning. Observe, too, the vexatious precision, with which we were to perform (at the bidding of our masters,) the several acts of homage imposed upon us—Observe the strictness of the discipline that was to be exacted,—the lengthened and wearisome *routine* of ignominious details, which we were called upon to pass, to the “satisfaction” of the framers of that resolution;\* who promised to look on “cheerfully” at our debasement,—and even to reward us if we should be successful in our humble efforts to please! If this be not the precise import of the terms, which the Council of Rites thought *fitting* to offer, I must confess myself grossly ignorant of the meaning of words; and that the money spent by my parents, in their attempt to provide for me a decent education, has been lamentably thrown away.

Your letter proceeds to say;—“With the knowledge of this termination of the conference on my mind, you may judge of my astonishment on finding, a short time after, what purported to be an account of that conference, in the newspapers; in which it was said, that Brothers M‘Causland and Copinger proposed to produce all their records, and muniments, provided we would, in like manner, produce ours; but that, from this “*honest and manly course* of arrangement, we, the delegates of the Council of Rites, shrank with conscious weakness.” With such an *OPEN DISREGARD FOR TRUTH*, published in the newspapers, and afterwards, several times, reprinted in an anonymous Pamphlet, I declared indignantly, in the Grand Lodge, that I so heartily despised such a system of conduct, that I would never again condescend to any future conference.”

That the language of this flight is glowing,—and, also, that no man on earth has a better right, than I possess, to comment upon it, must be admitted upon all hands. One part of it I can corroborate by the most ample testimony, viz.—that, as

\* Including (*perhaps*,—for the language is not very perspicuous) the monstrous item of proving the seal and hand-writing of John Peree, his predecessors and successors.

regards the business of "condescension," you have kep your word, and that your example has been followed by the Supreme Grand Council of Rites, and soforth, at large. In the year 1842, it would not "condescend" to adopt the suggestions of its Patron, the Duke of Leinster; but *unanimously* opposed "every wish" of his Grace. I enclose you a copy of the Duke's letter, in which you will find the proofs of this averment.\* In February, 1844, the Council of Rites, by its agents, persuaded the Grand Lodge to pass a resolution, which is now distributed *gratis* to the public, in circulars, bearing the autograph of one Thomas Wright. That resolution does not directly, and in terms, stigmatize the Grand Chapter as an illegal body, because every member of the Grand Lodge, without exception, and even the most inexperienced and inconsiderate person, would at once perceive, from a resolution so framed, that the said Grand Lodge had exceeded its jurisdiction,—and rendered itself ridiculous in the eyes of the Free-Masonic world. How far Mr. Quinton has rescued it from this scandal, by the use of indefinite expressions, and terms to which little or no meaning may be affixed, I shall not presume to say; but shall refer you to the *Freemason's Quarterly Review*,—a publication conducted with great spirit, and supported and approved by the most distinguished members of the Free-Masonic community in these kingdoms.†

But, though the Grand Lodge has not been guilty of the pre-

\* "Carton, Maynooth, 4th Nov., 1842.

"Sir,—Immediately on my return to Ireland, I had the Supreme Grand Council of Rites summoned, when my letter to you, of the 14th of May, 1842, and your answer of the 18th, were taken into consideration.

"Having entered most fully into the facts of the case, and, with every wish on my part to carry my intentions into effect, matters were brought before me, which, I am sorry to say, have rendered it utterly impossible for the Grand Council of Rites to comply with my suggestions. I must add, that this was the unanimous opinion of the meeting; which I request you will inform those who signed the memorial.

"I have the honour to be, &c., &c.,

"LEINSTER."

† Opinion of the *Freemason's Quarterly Magazine*, March, 1844.—"A letter will be found in another part, addressed to the Grand Lodge of Ireland, and it refers to one very important point, viz: the more than questionable power of the Grand Lodge to entertain the consideration of subjects unconnected with its constitution; yet, at the Grand Lodge, in February last, a motion was *put and carried*—we will not say it was *debated*,—for it is confessedly acknowledged, by both Montagues and Capulets, that the scene, during which this singular drama was enacted, cannot be reported at length, for very SHAME's sake. \* \* \* The Charge in the English Institution declares, that no mason, or body of masons, can make innovations in Freemasonry; the constitution of the Grand Lodge of Ireland acknowledged an inherent power to make new regulations *for the benefit of the Fraternity, always preserving the old landmarks*. We should like to know how the above motion"—(the motion of the 1st of February, above-mentioned)—"corresponds with these essential points. \* \* It is well understood that his Grace is fettered by a POWER BEHIND THE CHAIR."

sumption, and utter folly, of thus *directly* assailing the Grand Chapter, it has certainly acted towards us with little CEREMONY, DISCRETION, or JUSTICE, by adopting a resolution which, "strictly prohibits, as unlawful, all assemblies of Freemasons in Ireland, under any title whatsoever, purporting to be masonic, not held by virtue of a warrant or constitution from the Grand Lodge, or from the other masonic bodies, recognized by, and acting in unison with, the Grand Lodge of Ireland." Now, I say, this resolution was, in the first place, UNJUST, because it was an indirect attempt to assume an authority over superior degrees, of which the Grand Lodge cannot, and does not, even pretend to have cognizance, or control. ~~IT IS THE FIRST STEP MADE BY THE GRAND LODGE TOWARDS ASSUMING A POLITICAL AND DANGEROUS CHARACTER;~~ and its next step, if the same advisers be listened to, may be to assume, in the same tortuous and indirect manner, a jurisdiction over the society of Friendly Brothers; over the Orangemen, or Repealers. The use of the word "masonic" in the resolution, only disguises its absurdity and injustice; it, in reality, removes no objection; for the Grand Lodge has not, and cannot pretend to have, any authority whatsoever over degrees of masonry which it does not possess, any more than it has authority over the Conservative society, or the Corporation of Dublin.\*

I say, next, the resolution was *INDISCREET*; for if it is not intended to be a nullity, it will be put into immediate operation against your esteemed correspondent. Nay—it should have been put into operation ere now,—because, since the resolution passed in the Grand Lodge,—the Grand Chapter did meet,—I being its president for the occasion,—of all which, as the pleaders say, the said Duke of Leinster, and the said Council of Rites, then and there had due notice. I "hurl" no "high or haughty defiance" against the Grand Lodge; on the contrary, I trust and hope, that it will not again listen to those, who have already deluded it, and, so far as regards its treatment of the Prince Masons of Ireland, gained for it, *ALL OVER THE UNITED KINGDOM*, the character of the "*indictum parliamentum*" of Freemasonry. I therefore think, though I am not able positively to predict, that the resolution will be treated as it deserves, namely, as a dead letter, by the Grand Lodge itself, and that it will not be put into operation, either against myself or any other person, whose only crime consists in being a member of a superior degree, without accepting a warrant from an inferior,—or from a spurious society such as the Council of Rites is.

And I say, also, that this resolution is *UNCEREMONIOUS*. Can it

\* The Act of Parliament concerning secret societies, &c., expressly enjoins, that all meetings of Freemasons, in Ireland, *SHALL* be held under a masonic name, or denomination. But the Grand Lodge repeals (*pro suo vigore*) this positive enactment of the Legislature, and directs that, except in certain pet cases, meetings of Freemasons, in Ireland, *shall not* be held, if purporting to be masonic, *i.e.* under a masonic name; and that such meetings, if in obedience to the laws of the realm, shall *THEREFORE* be deemed unlawful.

be necessary for me to proceed to *prove this* assertion, when the Supreme Grand Council and soforth, which eschews all "condescension," was at the bottom of the proceeding?

Again, the Grand Chapter, as anxious to avoid, as the Council of Rites was, (and is) to produce, and provoke, a collision between the former and the Grand Lodge of the blue degree, offered,—immediately after the passing, (as is said)\* of that resolution,—to decept, from the Duke of Leinster, as Grand Master, such an authority, or license, as might bring it within the spirit of the exceptions contained in the prohibitory order.

His Grace, however, objected, that offers had been addressed to him by the name, style, and title, of Grand Master of Free and Accepted Masons; but intimated that he would be ready to reply to our proposal, if addressed to him as Grand President of the Council of Rites. Here *was*, indeed, an act of condescension; one, which his Grace appeared anxious should be entered to the exclusive credit of your Chapter. As Grand Master of the Blue or Craft degree, he would not consider the case at all; but, *quaed* President of the Council of Rites, he would be all attention, and CONDESCENSION. The Grand Chapter,—or if you please, the Chapter "of Peree, and others," to which I belong,—therefore lost no time in forwarding, to his Grace, an address, prepared as nearly as possible in accordance with the prescribed form. It was accordingly replied to, though in very brief terms, stating merely, that His Grace had forwarded it to the Grand Council of Rites. The promised "condescension" was thus accorded to us, and I have good reason to believe, that the language of his Grace's reply would not have been (as it was) that of cold politeness, and reserve, but that of kindness and fraternal consideration, had almost any other member of the Chapter, than the humble individual who then filled the office of Sovereign, been made the medium of communication. I, however, (perhaps injudiciously) insisted upon my right, and protested, that it would not be fair towards me, (nor what I much more regarded) respectful to my office, to call upon me abruptly to resign the chair, and its duties, merely because my successor had not rendered himself unacceptable to his Grace, by addressing to him (as I had done, on former occasions, upon my own individual responsibility, and without consulting with any person,) letters of strong observation, and fearless remonstrance. I therefore was, *virtute officii*, the person nominated to transmit certain proposals, and copies of proceedings, &c. to the Duke of Leinster, from whom I received as courteous a letter, as, under all the circumstances, could have been expected, by the person to whom it was addressed. I believe that his Grace is, at this moment, actuated by feelings of kindness towards the Grand Chapter; that he feels it has suffered

---

\* I use the words in the parenthesis; for there are grave doubts as to what really was done on the 1st of February; and, from the remarks which I send you of the *Freemason's Quarterly Review*, it may be concluded to be a fact admitted upon all hands, that the whole proceeding was a disgrace to any society professing to be deliberative.

much unmerited injury ;—and I **BELIEVE**, that he is earnestly and sincerely anxious to enforce salutary measures of justice ; but that, as the Editor of the *Freemason's Quarterly Review* remarks—“ He is prevented by a power behind the Chair.” For this belief, I have better grounds than mere inference, or imagination. I **KNOW** that his wishes have been opposed—strenuously opposed—by the Council of Rites, for the last 3 or 4 months. You will not contradict this, and I am much mistaken if any one will assume the responsibility of doing so. You know, also, that his Grace was—for he *must* have been—willing, that the matters in question, between the two bodies, should be referred to the decision of an arbitrator, as we had suggested ; that the arbitrator should be the person whom we had proposed, namely, the Provincial Grand Master in Carey and Dunluce, who had been initiated into the Rose Croix in the Chapter of Bristol, and was, therefore, the more likely to be a disinterested party,—who was, also, an honorary member of your own Chapter,—and who had held strong, if not extreme, opinions against us, until he had examined into our case, and found—what he *must* have found—that the charges made against us were, all and each of them, untrue. The Archdeacon, accordingly, expressed himself willing to aid, impartially, in the restoration of peace ; and declared, that, if the matter were referred to him, he would do justice without fear or favour, between the contending parties. I have reason to believe that he has made no secret of his opinions, but that he has communicated them to his Grace, and also to the Grand Council of Rites ; and, if I am not greatly misinformed, one part, of the opinions so communicated to you, was, that the Grand Chapter is as legal as any in the world. We exhibited to him all our records, extending as I have told you, over a period of more than 60 years,—we answered all his enquiries, we gave him the fullest information, and we produced evidences, and vouchers, for all we said : I say, that we produced a chain of testimony, which would establish any case, and such as has seldom been brought before any court,—I say this evidence will convince any man whose eyes are not blinded by passion, or interest,—I say this evidence **HAS ALWAYS CONVINCED EVERY MAN** to whom it has been shown,—I say this evidence convinced **HIM**—for it is impossible that it would have failed to do so,—and I tell you fairly, that it is as potent, and irrefragable **AGAINST** your Chapter, as it is in favor of ours.\*

\* Previous to this reference to Dr. Mant, some of the leading members of the Grand Chapter, including its then Sovereign and Grand Secretary, having been so fortunate as to obtain an introduction to a Gentleman of the highest distinction in the Masonic community of England, Brother Crucifix of London, requested of him to advocate their cause to the Duke of Leinster, for the purpose of disabusing his Grace's mind of the erroneous and confounded prejudices, by which it continued to be misled. Doctor Crucifix, having minutely inspected all our documents, and, I believe, being in possession of the whole case of the Council of Rites, so far as that case could be known by the *ex parte* statements of its adherents,—most kindly undertook the task, and addressed a letter upon the subject to his Grace, who, however, in his

In short, you well know, that I am only recalling to your recollection known facts, not communicating any new intelligence, when I state, that, in the aforesaid address to his Grace, we proposed to submit it to *any Prince Mason of foreign initiation*, to be agreed upon by both parties—to examine, and report, upon the titles and pretensions, of the Council of Rites and of the Grand Chapter, to the rank of Prince Grand Rose Croix—his decision to be considered final between the parties. You know that we went farther than this, by pledging ourselves to be bound by *suggestions* of that arbitrator, *ultra* the decision, even though that arbitrator should be one of your own patrons,—while we did not require *you* to bind yourselves to follow any such suggestion, but only to submit to the decree upon the subject of legality of Title. You refused this fair and most liberal proposal,—shall I say this “honest and manly course?” But why or wherefore you refused it, I have never *distinctly* heard; and, upon my honour, I am quite unable to conceive, unless the reason be *that*, which I have always supposed, viz. :—that, at least, the great majority of the managers of your cause, are aware, that it cannot bear one moment’s investigation. Such were our proposals, sent to the Duke of Leinster on the 18th of April, 1844. For more than two months, we waited for an answer, as if we had been begging an alms; while the *gubernatores* of the Grand Council of Rites, perceiving the extremity to which it was reduced by these proposals, resorted to the most unscrupulous, and unhandsome means, of evading the issue, which had been tendered,—an issue, which could not be accepted without the most imminent peril, nor refused without indelible disgrace. During these two months, two members of the Grand Chapter,—doubtless not uninvited or unsolicited,—deserted their colors, and went over to the Council of Rites. Has the Grand Chapter been weakened by the defalcation of these proselytes? They never intimated to the Sovereign, or to any member of the Grand Council, that they had a doubt of its title,—they never asked for explanation of any difficulty,—they never indicated their intention,—but, to the last moment, kept us in the dark,—and the first notice we had, of the secret manœuvrings adopted on behalf of the Council of Rites,

reply to the Doctor, “declined to interfere in so *SERIOUS* an affair.” *Serious*, no doubt, it was, and is; and it is likely to become more so, unless his Grace will exercise the powers which are vested in him, and *compel* an investigation. Had he done so before now, and when thereto urged by Doctor Crucifix, the character of the Council of Rites might have been saved from those recent exposures, which its own infatuated violence has brought upon it; and, however disreputably it must now get out of the scrape, his Grace may rest assured, that the matter cannot be “mended” by delay: on the contrary, *the mummy has been opened*, and,—exposed to light and air—the decomposition, which was before proceeding slowly and secretly, will now progress more rapidly,—will become more and more conspicuous and offensive every day,—and will require still stronger and more caustic applications to arrest its advances. The “case,” in short, will become more and more “*SERIOUS*,” until it is rendered wholly incurable.

was from seeing the names of these persons in your printed list. On others, the same indirect and unjustifiable artifices were attempted ; but without success. This was one part of the plan, by which our proposals were to be CUSHIONED. It was hoped, that, by vigorous operations of undermining, the Grand Chapter would be broken up, and that the few, who would remain staunch, would be too disheartened to persist in its defence, with much activity, or spirit. It was hoped that ~~THUS~~ the necessity, of dealing ~~AT ALL~~ with our proposals, would cease, and that the negotiation which was so perilous, would "die a natural death." Accordingly, delay followed delay, in order to protract, for the purposes of deceitful warfare, that period, during which the Grand Chapter suspended all its meetings, and initiations, because it felt, that a *TRUCE OF HONOR* had been set up. I defy the Council of Rites to assign a single reason, that will bear to be mentioned, for these delays, or for the eventual refusal, which, on or about the 20th of June, was communicated to the Duke of Leinster, but of which we (of course) received no communication for another month, or upwards, and then only through the medium of a casual *GOSSIP*. I say "of course" no answer from the Council of Rites, every member of which was as silent as the grave, as to the intentions of that body,—for delay was its *GAME*. Tell me not, that the Duke of Leinster was the person from whom—and not from the Council of Rites, we should, in point of strict *etiquette*, have expected a reply. This I admit ; but this, also, I do say—that a studied and systematic secrecy was all through preserved, which might have been dispensed with, without any breach of either etiquette or fair dealing ; and I say, also, that the Grand Chapter has some right to complain, that, wherever the Supreme Grand Council of Rites is concerned, the effect of all etiquette, and of all formalities, and ceremonies, is, to heap additional insults upon the former, and to multiply its grievances and injuries. These numerous acts of offence, we are happily able to endure, though we shall never make similar reprisals. "Of course," then, we received no answer from the Council of Rites, and I confess, that, in that minor matter, it has been able to make the practice of etiquette square with its purposes of injustice. *Well that body knew the delicate footing upon which we stood with the Duke of Leinster, and that, each time we would apply to his Grace for an answer, there would be a new chance, in favour of the Council of Rites, that the old prejudices of his Grace against us, and still more against the organ of the Grand Chapter on that occasion, might be renewed, or revived, by our repeated importunities.* Such, perhaps, was the case. We did ply the Duke with our respectful entreaties, that we might be informed of his Grace's pleasure, in his capacity of Grand President of the Council of Rites ; and the Council of Rites was equally well plied with letters from the Duke, from time to time, urging them to come to some conclusion, respecting the proposals, which he had referred to them. The Provincial Grand Master was also besieged with numerous epistles ; and, I believe, he also kept up a smart fire upon these prudent warriors, who, however, hid their diminished heads,

upon the prospect of their pretensions being made the subject of examination, or reasoning: and would not be tantalized, or provoked, or—as sometimes happens in Ireland—*coaxed* into controversy, or reaction. They preferred safety, however momentary and ignominious, to an honourable but instant defeat. After the lapse of two months, it seems, they were pleased to decide, their determination being, to avoid the danger, even at the risk of the disgrace. Of this final determination, the Duke of Leinster did not think proper to inform us. Perhaps his Grace conceived, that, when we would next apply to him, it would be time enough for him to announce to us, under his hand, the shabby conduct of the Council over which he had the misfortune to preside. But we felt that we had already trespassed sufficiently, if not too often, upon his Grace's attention, concerning a subject, upon which we conceived that we ought to have been more frankly met; and I, for one, would not consent to urge that topic any further.

Thus, the Council of Rites has pursued its old policy, of making the Duke of Leinster the *Scape-Goat* upon all occasions. Thus they place him in the breach, in the time of danger. I understand, that, in the gossiping communication above referred to, it was stated, (I think by Mr. Norman, your Vice-President,) that the reason why the Council of Rites refused our proposals was, that, by assenting to them, an enquiry might be set on foot respecting the *Title of the Duke!*—And, is THIS the “reason” which they expected that his Grace would have the unmanliness to communicate to us? How could he say this? Could he write to us, “I am afraid of my own Title,—I must refuse Justice, lest it press too heavily on myself?” He has thus been placed in a position, in which he had the choice only of two courses,—either to give us no answer,—which was the readier plan, and therefore adopted, or to tell us AGAIN, what he told us in 1842, (*vide* his letter) that he is cruelly persecuted by his protegees,—that they oppose all his wishes &c.,—reject all his suggestions,—and that he is not a free agent—but must subscribe to the **POWER BEHIND THE CHAIR**. Thus this nobleman,—I will say this amiable nobleman,—is hunted into a corner, by those, who, if they had a spark of gratitude or generosity, would bear the brunt of every danger, sooner than put him into peril. Well they knew, that it was not our wish to question his title; and we have explicitly told his Grace, that, in the event of any fair arrangement, we would acknowledge, validate, and pronounce it good. We have heard that His Grace was initiated abroad;—and, even if this be not the fact, his is a case most fit to be dealt with as an exception from the usual rules,—and especially, he ought not to be made the sufferer, in consequence of his enforcing an act of Justice. I say he is precluded from giving us that answer, which he wishes to give, and which, even *WERE* the consequences to be injurious to his title as a *Prince Grand Rose Croix Mason!* (which they would not be, but the reverse,) his own judgment, and sense of Justice, would at once oblige him to concede, were not undue and ungenerous advantages taken of the anomalous position, in which I must admit that he is placed;—though I think he over estimates its

difficulty, and yields to a pressure which he should shake off. For I do not, I confess, see why he should not turn upon his pursuers, who have so abused his confidence, and who,—having first deceived him,—now bind him hand and foot, to protect the projectors of the deception. His Grace, certainly, is in a most difficult and perplexing dilemma, in which, though he *be* made the instrument of injustice, it would be most unfair to scan his conduct by rules which are applicable only to common cases. He is in a difficulty, in consequence of the **POWER BEHIND THE CHAIR**. That power is equally haughty, and tyrannical, in its own disposition and projects, as it is unprincipled, and vindictive towards its opponents, and unfeeling towards its friends. It is essentially selfish; and for the accomplishment of its selfish objects, and passions, it holds the reins, with a clumsy, but determined hand, and keeps the bit painfully, but firmly, in the mouth of its Patron.

The Grand Chapter, on the contrary, has ever displayed its respect for the Duke of Leinster,—not as the head of an illustrious family,—and, certainly, not because he is nominally at the head of the Council of Rites,—but as the Grand Master of the *Craft* Masons, and as principal of all the other grades of Freemasonry that are practised in Ireland, under the degree of Rose Croix. We have always displayed a consideration for his feelings, even when acting against us; and though we have never been afraid to speak aloud, what the interests of truth, and what our own sense of independence, required to be told, we have, in all our transactions with, or concerning his Grace, invariably endeavoured to the utmost to avoid either giving or taking offence. We have put the mildest, the best, the most fraternal and favorable construction, upon those acts which he has done, or permitted to be done, to our prejudice; — we have always taken care to leave open, and accessible to him, the approach, by which he might be united to us, and might escape the trammels, in which he is, at present, held. This you may, if you please, call policy,—but it is, at least, an honest policy, and one in which it is our resolution to persevere. And, allow me to assure you, that, among our motives for adopting it, the least was, and is, the remote chance of any benefit to be derived by the Grand Chapter, in consequence of his Grace's possible adhesion to it; — while the greatest, and the prevailing object which influenced us, has been, to rescue the Freemasonic community, in Ireland, from those schisms, which are its present infamy, and the precursors of its speedy ruin. We had, also, other intermediate objects in view. We were anxious to make it manifest to our masonic brethren,—and, also, to the public at large, to whom the Council of Rites had made appeal, through the columns of the public newspapers, that,—while we would not allow that body, with impunity,—no matter by whom patronised,—to publish us, and our most distinguished members, by name, as impostors,—we would still act with a cool and firm discretion, as became insulted gentlemen, and not like savages smarting under the lash. We always, therefore, drew a distinction in favour of the Duke of Leinster, in consequence of the peculiarity of his

unenviable position. We asked ourselves, ~~W<sup>TH</sup> AT OBJECT~~ could he have but to act, *as he conceived*, honorably, and correctly? We felt that if he erred,—or if, having but the choice of errors, he elected to commit the worst,—his error was one of judgment,—and that his intentions must have been to do what was right. We could not suppose, that ~~SERIE NUGAE~~, such as the validity of his title to a mere masonic degree,—and that, too, a modern one, invented for the Pretender, Charles Stuart,—could have a feather's weight in the scale of *principle* with a man, whose noble conduct in early life, and upon the death of his illustrious father, has shed around his name a lustre, which titles only, and lordships, can never bestow. Much as he has injured us, through your instrumentality, he shall receive no injustice at our hands. And creditably does he stand in contrast to the man, who, from innate baseness of nature, abandons a just cause, only because it has nothing but right and justice to support it! In an evil hour he consented to patronize your claims;—he continues to do so still, *because* the existence of the Conclave is in the breath of his nostrils,—*because* it is at its last gasp,—and, *because*, while it is in this helpless position, he has the misfortune, and the discredit, of being its patron. Therefore, upon the whole, I need not now say, whether his Grace has, or has not, in such difficult circumstances, chosen the lesser, or the greater, of two evils. I do say, however, and assert, without fear of contradiction, that he is not permitted to do what he would wish to do, for the sake of justice and honor, even ~~WERE~~ it to his own hindrance. There is a power,—forgive me for saying, there is both a parasite, and an impostor,—behind the chair. There is also that, which, I would hope, has, in this case, more influence with his Grace, than either flattery or fable,—there is *utter helplessness*, which looks up to *him alone* for protection. Fear not, then, our policy,—if such it is to be called,—he will not desert your Chapter in the death-struggle; but if ever again he come forward prominently to injure us, as he has hitherto done, I shall admit that I have formed a most erroneous estimate of his character; and if he come forward to announce his approval of the proceedings of the Supreme Grand Council of Rites, during the two months of delay to which I have alluded, and of its refusal to accede to our proposals above-mentioned,—*I shall never again put faith in man.*

I can envy neither the persons, nor the cause, to which such patronage is extended;—I commiserate the unhappy condition of the protector. Myself a commoner,—a plebeian,—and an humble one,—I still can sympathise with his Grace,—feeling, as I do, that the Duke of Leinster must suffer keenly from being compelled by this *POWER*, (or rather, this *WEAKNESS*,) behind the chair, to assume an adverse position against a number of inoffensive Freemasons, and gentlemen, whose claims, he has every reason to believe, and to know, are just; but it must be some consolation to him to reflect, that his injustice is, at least, free from *MEANNESS*,—and, so far, it is the error of a FitzGerald.

You may say that I have spun out a lengthened yarn of that

one thread, which the word "condescension" has supplied ; but what I have said is, at least, to the general purpose of your letter, and of the subject of it.—and I also felt that I could not fix upon a more appropriate place for the introduction of unwelcome truths, than where it became my duty to comment upon that part of your letter, in which the genius of the Council of Rites appears to have guided your pen, and to have misled it, for a season, from that course of undeviating courtesy, into which,—had it been under your sole management,—it would, I am sure, have been, more obligingly, as well as more judiciously turned.

For,—to revert to that passage of your letter, which I have quoted at length,—you speak of "AN OPEN DISREGARD OF TRUTH" inserted, you say, in the newspapers, and repeated in a certain "anonymous" pamphlet.

Now, with regard to this "anonymous" pamphlet,—it is quite true,—the author's name was not expressed upon the title page ; but I aver that you can have no more doubt, as to the source from which the said pamphlet emanated, than you have respecting the authorship of the Waverly Novels. There was, indeed, no secrecy observed upon this point ; and several persons have offered, in the most public manner, to hold themselves responsible, for all and each of the allegations contained in the "Few Words"—among the rest, Mr. Ellis, I think, offered to do so, and I made the offer, myself, in a very public assembly. I make that offer still ; but I will hold myself amenable only to public opinion, or to the decision of an arbitrator, or arbitrators, in the selection of whom, my opponents, and myself, shall have an equal voice. I will thus hold myself responsible for the truth of all and each of the statements in that tract contained,—but not for the mere fact of printing, because I find, in the Ahiman Rezon, a Grand Lodge Order prohibiting the publication of matters connected with THE CRAFT, and I do not choose to place myself, unnecessarily, in the troublesome position of being obliged to prove, to a packed Grand Lodge, that even that technical rule has not been infringed. For this reason, I will not inform you who the author is, nor admit that I have any cognizance of the fact, otherwise than through the medium of an uncontradicted report. But I, at the same time, afford you all that can be wanted for any fair purpose ; for I tell you, that I adopt every sentence of these "Few Words," from first to last, and am quite ready, at any moment, to join issue with you upon any part of the same. I will even go further,—for I hereby repeat, upon the pledge of my personal credit,—what I have frequently declared with equal solemnity, that every MATERIAL and positive averment, in the tract in question, is strictly true. I cannot, indeed, affix the like solemn verification, to every light and unimportant passage,—to matters merely of oral tradition,—or to assertions, the correctness of which can, from the nature of the case, be known, with certainty, only to my opponents : e.g.—I cannot SWEAR, that, in the first page of the Records of your Chapter, in or about the year 1800, its spurious title, and descent from Zimmerman, is set out exactly as it is stated and described by the

author of the tract,—(*vide* the *Few Words*, p. 8;) for the book, in which, I am assured that that fatal entry was seen and read, may not now be in existence, or preservation,—and various other contingencies may be imagined, which would render it very *unsafe* for me to rest all, and everything, upon this sole incidental assertion. But I will rest the whole claims of the Grand Chapter of Ireland upon THIS: namely, that whether such entry does or does not exist, or remain, upon your book,—it *ought to be there*; because it would be only a simple record of the truth. Neither, certainly, shall I affirm upon oath, that your elevation, to the rank of Sovereign, took place in 1802;—it is for you to prove the contrary if you can,—in opposition to the testimony that was, at one time, afforded by your escutcheon.

And as to the tradition mentioned in the pamphlet, concerning Edward Bruce having introduced the art of Prince Masonry into Ireland, I do not consider that averment to be of the slightest materiality, or importance, as regards the objects for which that tract was written. Moreover, I shall add, that I do not now, as once I did, consider that tradition to be entitled to credit,—at least, in the form in which it is stated in the "*Few Words*." Since the tract was published, I have had opportunities, enjoyed by few, of investigating matters of this kind; and I find it fully proved, that the Order of Rose Croix was invented by the adherents of the Pretender, upon the model, as it would seem, of the "Royal Order of Scotland;"—for which, however, I believe it is but an unsubstantial substitution. If, therefore, there is any truth at all in the tradition mentioned, the system introduced into the North of Ireland, in the 14th century, must have been the Royal Order, of which Robert Bruce was the founder, and of which one of the degrees is, I believe, termed that of Knight of the Rosey Cross,—which similarity of name has produced much confusion, and explains why the high antiquity of that celebrated Scottish system has been frequently attributed to its shewy namesake,—the modern Rose Croix.

Thus, you perceive how readily I can admit my error, or confess my doubts of a former opinion, when I see reason to change my mind, or to hold my judgment in suspense. My maxim is,

“*Fiat justitia—ruat oculum.*”

But, I need not pursue this explanation further,—for no man, in his senses, can mistake the plain meaning of my pledge, or suppose, that it can have reference to trifling inaccuracies, uncertain and remote oral traditions, or straggling and unimportant observations, such as these.

Having thus declared the pamphlet to be "anonymous," because the writer's name was not actually put into type,—you proceed to designate it, as an audacious and lying production;—your words are, "an open disregard of truth." Now, in what respect, let me ask you, does your own account differ from that, which is given in this "best-abused" of pamphlets?—You, —of course, unintentionally,—misquote its statements, and, after combating the phantom of your own creation,—and de-

nouncing, in no measured language, assertions, which, you say, were made, but, which, I am obliged to say, were not made,—you deliver a narrative, which, in point of fact, admits every averment, for which you censure the anonymous scribbler. For the pamphlet did not aver, simply, that "we offered to produce our title, provided the Council of Rites would do likewise;" nor was this meagre, and inconclusive proposal, that, which we could designate, as "an honest and manly course." That was a *part*, indeed; but it was only a *part* of our offer, to be taken in conjunction with the rest, viz.:—that both parties, having so produced their titles, should agree to be concluded thereby. This, I say, was the offer made by us, and this is what the pamphlet, (p. 15,) states to have been so made,—the latter item having been as distinctly insisted on, as those parts, which alone seem to have met your vision. Now, without this latter item,—which you take no more notice of, than if it had not formed a part of the very sentence which you complain of in the said pamphlet,—the production of titles would have been frivolous, and worse than frivolous, because, an open would have been left, for one party, (I will not say which,) first, to say, "Here are our books, &c.,"—and, if those books, or portions of books and letters, which it might have been deemed convenient to shew, passed off as sufficient, then all would be excellently well,—but, if a fatal defect, in the title, so produced, was detected, and other documents called for,—that party might then have added,—"Oh! we cannot go into *that*,—or, we cannot go behind the year 1836,—or, we cannot do this thing, or exhibit that other thing, which might bring the title of this or that person into question, &c." Our proposals were calculated to prevent all such evasions,—on either side; because they required, that each party should be finally bound by his case, as he would then and there be able to work it out,—which, in my opinion, was "an honest and manly course,"—and at all events, it was the course, which the tract avers to have been suggested on behalf of the Grand Chapter, but refused by the Council of Rites.

After all,—upon this delicate topic,—namely, your inaccurate quotation,—I confess, that it does not seem to me to make much difference, whether the *item*, which you omit, did, or did not, expressly form a part of our proposals,—because that *item* must, I think, be understood as *implied* among rational men, in the case of a *bona fide* proposal for mutual investigations, and for a comparison of contending claims. What else could be the object of such an investigation, or to what purpose, or effect, could the mutual inspection of titles tend, unless that *item* had been understood,—namely,—unless it had been understood, and agreed, that the bad title should be abandoned, and the good acknowledged predominant?

But the extreme laxity with which you treat this matter,—affecting, as it does, the character of Mr. Copinger, Mr. Ellis, myself, and others,—and the uncommon *nonchalance*, and *sang-froid*, with which you express your "indignation," and declare

that you "heartily despise such conduct," meaning, by "such conduct," misrepresentations, for which myself and the members of the Grand Chapter are responsible,—I say,—that laxity of argument, joined with much severity of censure, on your part, compels me to be as strict, and methodical, upon the point in question, as you are discursive, and careless. It is your **OMISSION** of this *item*, COUPLED WITH your mode of dealing with the rest of the sentence, as if such *item* had not been even *implied*, while, in point of fact, it was actually expressed,—it is your mode of treating the subject,—that obliges me to examine so accurately, the terms and the import of your circumlocution. For observe,—the question which you were assuming to answer, was this,—whether you had, on any occasion, *asserted*, that an amicable adjustment between the two bodies had *been* put out of the question, by an **UNQUALIFIED** and **UNCONDITIONAL** refusal upon the part of the Grand Chapter, to show its title, &c.—(Vide my first letter, dated the 5th July.) For every body knows, that the principal delegate of the Grand Chapter refused to indulge your curiosity, by submitting its records to your inspection, without an engagement, *properly guaranteed*, that there should be an unreserved and complete disclosure upon both sides;—but, as appears from the tenor of the resolution passed by the Council of Rites, *you*, i.e. your Chapter or Constituents, — would not allow your title *to be questioned*, nor would enter upon the subject, otherwise than as persons of unquestioned purity, who were pleased to examine, and report upon, the character of certain other persons, of uncertain and doubtful reputation. These degrading terms we, of course, rejected,—and, as you say yourself, "upon the production of the resolution" which imposed them, we broke off the negociation. Why, then, have you so completely disregarded those two material and remarkable words, which my question contained,—the words "*unqualified and unconditional*?"

And have I not a right to complain, at this stage of the quarrel, —for it *is* a quarrel, between your Chapter and mine,—that you have seen fit to direct against one of our most distinguished members, *by name*, a censure, which, by manifest implication, extends to us all, and which, if it could be in the slightest degree substantiated, must render that gentleman and the rest of us, for ever contemptible in the eyes of all honourable men? And how have you made the occasion for doing this? You are asked a simple question, which required an unconditional and unqualified answer, but which you answer by a circumlocution, in which you loosely and vaguely assert, that certain loose and vague statements were put forward by us, which we never did put forward,—but which, if they *had been* put forward, could never be wrested to the meaning that you assign to them; and having thus constructed an offence, out of a confusion which you have yourself created, you indignantly declare that you heartily despise such a system of conduct!

I say, we refused to produce our title,—but this was because you refused to produce yours,—that is,—you refused to allow

it to be questioned,—you refused to allow us to go behind it,—you would not allow it to be put in issue,—you required that *it* should be, in the first place, acknowledged by us,—and that, then, ours should be taken into your consideration. The minutes of the Council of Rites prove this,—for all that it would allow its delegates to do, was “simply to convince us, that Peree, having been initiated in the original (Kilwinning) Chapter of Prince Masons; and that the Chapter, over which said Peree did afterwards preside, having been formed subsequent to the introduction of the Order among the original (Kilwinning) Chapter; it could not, of COURSE! be the original, but a second, as *it was always allowed to be!*”

This “authorization” to your delegates purported to be framed in accordance with his Grace’s wishes. Now, it is clear, from the Duke’s letter, that his “wishes” were, to convince us of the accuracy of his Grace’s assertions, viz.: *that your Chapter had records in its possession which would convince any man of its originality.* But the Council of Rites endeavors to evade those wishes, and to exclude altogether, from the proposed conference, that, which the fair mind of the Duke of Leinster had contemplated, as its especial, and peculiar object,—viz.: the proofs of the originality and title of the Council of Rites,—and the disproof of our idea, that Mr. Zimmerman was expelled from “*our*” Chapter, and then formed “*yours.*” Your Chapter, I say, on this, as upon all other occasions, deceived its patron,—and, instead of authorizing its delegates to convince us of its right to those high claims of superiority, antiquity, and supremacy, which it had lately set up,—empowers them simply to ring changes upon the now hacknied tune, concerning the initiation of John Peree, and the minute thereof, in a book which had recently fallen into your possession! This was all that the Delegates were **REALLY** empowered to do, by the terms (which, I suppose, they well understood) of the Jesuitical resolution, which you have forwarded to me; and this, (important business!) it appears, *was done*,—(you are heartily welcome to the benefit of it,)—you shewed the book, in which that entry appears; and had Mr. Wright’s unwearying exertions, to get possession of our other book, been successful,—you would have shewn still more valuable entries;—all of them concerning a Chapter,—to wit, the Grand Chapter of Ireland,—wherewith you have no connection, save as its illegitimate offspring.

In the second Resolution of your Chapter, (his Grace, I presume, being then absent from the scene, as his letter intimated,) the casuistry of the first resolution was abandoned, and it was declared, without finesse, or the affectation of equity, that we must submit our title to your decision,—and that we must acknowledge yours by petitioning for a warrant. And you affirm, that it was upon production of this latter resolution, that Br. Copinger put an end to the conference.

How, then, I ask you, does your own account differ from that which is given in Mr. Ellis’s letter, and also in the tract, page 13? I say, that both are substantially the same,—that, which is in the tract, being succinct, definite, and clear; while yours is a circumlocution, that **AFFECTS** to contradict the former,—that misrepresents the former—but, in fact, not only leaves it uncontradicted, but **CONFIRMS** its statements!

Your language has been very vehement and personal,—yet no provocation shall urge me to say, of a Gentleman, who has been 50 years a member of the order, and who is now Deputy Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of Ireland, that he has wilfully attempted to pass upon me an idle sophism, the fallacy of which he perceived himself.

Some members of the Council of Rites, perhaps, might be capable of this,—because I find, that, in a case, in the issue of which the question of the existence of the Council of Rites was intimately involved, a broad sheet was printed, and industriously circulated in the City of Dublin, and elsewhere, in which the writer, (as you well know,) *for the purpose of proving that our minute of the expulsion of Zimmerman from the Rose Croix degree, was a forgery*, declared, that Zimmerman “was not an expelled mason,” urging as a proof thereof, that “his name continued on the Registry of the Grand Lodge, &c. &c.” *i. e.* of the *blue degree*;—*ergo*, the minute of his expulsion in our books was a forgery !!! But I do not attribute to you this shameful conduct; your disposition, I hope, would not lead you to it,—and your good sense, as the undoubted Ulysses of your Chapter, must, I am sure, have informed you, ere this, that the two or three victories (shall I say, also, “*victims?*”) which the Council of Rites has achieved (or gained) by trifling with the understanding of weak-minded individuals connected with the Grand Chapter, have, in point of fact, proved as unprofitable, as they must ever be dishonourable, to the victors,—and that, at all events, *I* was not among your list of those, whom you might hope to scare from the path of honesty, by offensive expressions,—or over whose mind, empty circumlocutions could be expected to have the force of reasoning. You, Sir, of all men connected with your Chapter, could most effectually set an example of straight-forward, perspicuous, and temperate discussion. Your experience, your unquestioned talents, and your acquaintance with the courtesies of society, make it the more incumbent upon you to prove the maxim, that

“*Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes  
Emollit mores,—nec sinit esse feros.*”

You, at least, with these accomplishments, ought to have been the last to make the groundless charge of falsehood, against gentlemen, whose real statements your own discursive circumlocutions confirm;—you, I must think, should have been the last to act in this manner, knowing, as you must, the sad necessity that exists, of instructing, by a directly contrary example, the less civilized members of your Chapter, to avoid,—for the sake of decency,—the repetition of those foolish arguments, and invectives, which form the staple commodity of its piratical trade; and to abstain from the perpetual re-production, and circulation, of those numerous broad-sheets, the contents of which would disgrace any electioneering placard.

I ask you, now, how is it possible for any person, who was not present at the interview in question, to avoid giving, under the circumstances of the case, the most complete credence to the account given in the Pamphlet? I say—“under all the circumstances of the case;”—for these afford most peculiar corroboration of the veracity of the “*anonymous*” author.

The statements in the pamphlet are confirmed by the following FACTS. First—that your denunciations, of “open disregard to truth,” apply only to a chimera of your own, and by no means apply to the narrative contained in the “*Few Words*.”

Secondly.—That the account, which you have yourself given of the transaction, does not militate with that given by “the unknown.” Your picture, perhaps, may want some material features, to make it a correct likeness of the original; but your sketch—*so far as it goes*—requires no alteration. I can, therefore, dovetail it into the former account, which I have received upon the most unquestionable testimony, and which has, for so many years, been publicly maintained, without an attempt being made to refute it;—though I profess that I do not see, how, by the addition of your story to ours, the latter can be in any wise affected.

Thirdly.—Although I never had the least personal acquaintance, nor any conversation, with any of the delegates of the Grand Chapter, yet their report, of the circumstances of the interview, has been repeatedly detailed to me by several gentlemen, and particularly by Mr. Ellis, who, at my request, lately held a minute conversation with his friend, Mr. Copinger, upon the subject. This was after I had received, and in consequence of, the information, which led to the present correspondence; and allow me to assure you, that the result, and gist of that conversation, is, that the said account is, in all material respects,—and especially in respect of the readiness, of the Grand Chapter, to display its title upon equal and fair terms,—strictly true. But

Fourthly.—With information which had been thus circuitously obtained, I felt that, although it had completely satisfied my own mind, I was not in such a position as would entitle me to address you on the subject. I therefore, subsequently, wrote to Mr. Copinger, for the purpose of procuring from him, in writing, a deliberate account, upon the accuracy of which, *others*, as well as myself, would, with certain assurance, depend; and which would preclude recourse to those trite, and trivial objections, which are sometimes made against all merely conversational statements. In my letter, I referred Mr. Copinger to the last 27 lines of p. 13 of the “*Few Words*,” whereof I enclosed him a copy, with the passage marked; and having alluded to the statements attributed to you, and to the contrary averments of the tract,—and to the position in which the author of the tract was placed, who, believing those averments to contain the simple truth, had printed and published the same,—I wrote to him as follows:—“I am about making a rather detailed entry, in our minute book, of this, among other matters, and will feel much obliged by your favouring me with a brief statement, or report, either that my version of the above story is correct, or informing me wherein it is erroneous, as I intend to verify, by a solemn affirmation, that I have received from you, upon the like assurance, the substance of my minute of the above-mentioned proceeding.” This request, accordingly, stands recorded upon our minutes, together with the answer of Mr. Copinger, which was in the following terms:—

“I think I have some memoranda relative to the meeting which you allude to. I will make a search for them; in the mean time

I beg to say, that you are substantially correct, in the statement which appears in the tract."\*

Thus, therefore, I leave the matter for you to deal with as you may be advised, only adding, that

Fifthly.—If the Council of Rites, or its agents, did, then and there, contrary to the assertion of Mr. Copinger, as above,—which assertion was obtained upon my solemn requisition, and adjuration,—if, I say, the Council of Rites, by its Delegates, did offer to produce its title, and to be bound thereby—we undertaking to do the like on our part,—then was that the first, and last, and only occasion, upon which your Chapter was ever guilty of such imprudence.

And, if the Grand Chapter did NOT, then and there, make the proposal specified, then was that the sole occasion, which it has ever lost, of shewing openly, and above-board, both, that it was prepared to take an "honest and manly course," and that the Council of Rites would never venture upon such a method of proceeding. I shall, indeed, rejoice to see the hour when your Chapter will refute this assertion, by the only means of refutation,—namely, by an acceptance of our public, recorded, and abiding challenge,—which, frequently offered before, is now repeated, and will never be withdrawn.

I must now hasten to conclude these sheets, the contents of which I would have probably been able to condense into a smaller compass, had the circumstances, under which I write, been favorable to my wish, to spare you, as much as possible, the trouble of wading through a voluminous communication.

---

\* The passage, which I had marked at p. 13 of the "Few Words," and to which the above verification refers, is as follows:—

"Accordingly, the two Committees met in the month of May, 1840, when the Delegates of the Grand Chapter declared, that they had brought with them, to the place of assembly, their ancient records, together with all the necessary Evidences, Vouchers, and Muniments of their title and descent, and that they were also prepared to prove that they were in possession of all the mysteries, and of the authority, appertaining to the several degrees, to which, as members of the Grand Chapter, they laid claim. They only stipulated that the Delegates from the Council of Rites should, upon their part, submit to a similar examination; and should, also, in like manner, produce their title and authority; and that the title so produced on either side, should be that, upon which alone each party respectively should rely, and by which it should be concluded. But the Committee of the Council of Rites unanimously refused to do this, and required that the title of the Grand Chapter should be submitted to their inspection, while they provided, that they should not be required to disclose theirs in return; and, in order to induce the Grand Chapter to that act, of reckless surrender of its cause into the hands of its adversaries, they only proposed, that, in case they,—the descendants of the degraded Zimmerman,—should, in their impartial wisdom, think proper to object to the title of the Grand Chapter, after they had sifted and investigated it, according to their own method, the Grand Chapter should have permission to petition the said Chapter of Zimmerman, under the bombastic appellation of the Council of Rites, to grant a warrant to it,—as a subordinate body,—under their irresponsible control; which petition they would take into consideration, and deal with it as they might feel inclined."

Trusting, however, that you will kindly make allowance for these circumstances, I now proceed to, perhaps, the most important point, to which your letter alludes.

You say, that Peree's Chapter grew out of the "original" Chapter, and that it was recognized by the latter, out of respect to Brother Zimmerman, its founder. You say, also, that Zimmerman installed Peree as Sovereign of this second chapter, to which you affix his name,—and in the minutes which you have extracted for me, from the books of the Council of Rites, I find a resolution of that body, on the 1st May, 1840, to which the following extraordinary preamble is prefixed.

"It having *been represented* (!) to us, that the Chapter of Prince Masons, of which Brother J. Peree was *the first Sovereign* (!) on or about the year 1790, is still in existence, Resolved, &c."

Now, no representation, such as is here slyly alluded to, could have been made by any person at all acquainted with the history of the Grand Chapter, as *that Peree was its first Sovereign*. *That* must be taken as the commentary, and misrepresentation of the Council of Rites. For let me tell you, sir, that on Easter Monday, in the year 1784, (six years before the time assigned in your minutes as the commencement of the existence of the Grand Chapter,) Brother Peree officiated as Senior Grand Warden of the Chapter, whereof you pretend that he was the founder, and first Sovereign, in 1790. And who was Sovereign, you may ask, during the time that Peree was Warden? My answer is,—Brother Sisson Putland Darling, who, on the Easter Monday above mentioned, filled the chair, and, as our minutes of that day state, was then and there *continued* (not first elected, but *continued*) M. W. Sovereign. This is of far greater moment than merely to shew, *generally*, that the minutes of the Council of Rites are not to be depended upon. This entry,—the genuineness and authority of which are beyond all question,—proves beyond a doubt, that the Grand Chapter, and not the Council of Rites, is the genuine descendant of the original, or Kilwinning, Chapter of Prince Masons, which was established, or revived, in Dublin, by Laurent, and other members of the London College, in or about 1782. The title of Sisson Darling stands unquestioned upon all sides. It is through him you attempt to deduce your own title; but I have shewn incontrovertibly, that if he did, for a short time, inconsiderately assist in the schemes of Zimmerman,—if he did, as you assert, co-operate in the discreditable affair of communicating to you the mysteries of Prince Masonry,—of which proceeding, however, *I believe you can produce no minute or entry in any genuine Masonic book*,—still, your title, thus derived *through him*,—or, I should rather say, through his unauthorized and invalid act,—can establish no claim whatever for your Chapter, as the descendant of the original, or Kilwinning Chapter, (otherwise, called, the Grand Chapter,) to which Darling belonged. Now we, on the other hand, can *prove*, by our ancient records, that we,—the Chapter of Peree,—are the direct, regular, and unquestionable legitimate successors, and descendants, of the Chapter of 1784, of which Sisson Putland

Darling was then Sovereign. We have the ancient entries in black and white, which render this as clear, and self-evident, as that two and two make four: we have Darling Sovereign in 1784—Peree being then Senior Warden; we have Peree Sovereign in 1790, and subsequent years, with John Boardman Senior Warden; and in 1800, and subsequent years, we find Boardman Sovereign, and so on. We have the same minutes—written in the same hand,—in the same old writing; and we have the *same men*, among the rest Sisson P. Darling, *continuing* a subscribing member of the Chapter from 1784, until his temporary retirement—after the *mesalliance*, or *liason*, with yourself and Zimmerman, in the year 1800,—and again becoming a frequent attendant at our meetings, after that affair had blown over. We have, thus, every proof of our identity with the original, or Kilwinning, or Grand Chapter, of 1784; while you shew no one link, whereby you can connect the Council of Rites therewith, save only a hole and corner meeting, between Zimmerman and one or two of his dupes, at which you were illegally initiated,—and for which Zimmerman was expelled.

Our possession of this prior minute, concerning Sisson Darling and others, in the year 1784, may well alarm you; as you must at once perceive, that it cuts from under your feet the whole ground-work, and fabric, of those ingenious illusions, upon which you and your Chapter stand;—illusions which, doubtless, you would not have ventured to exhibit to my optics, had you considered that we had possession of the minutes of 1784. But, you having put forward this argument,—there can be no creeping or wriggling out of it; or of evading the conclusive blow, which annihilates every pretence of the Council of Rites. You do not, and cannot deny,—for your entire scheme is built upon the supposition,—that Darling was a member of the Kilwinning, or original, Grand Chapter of Ireland. No doubt, he was,—for he was the successor of Laurent—and though you may be correct in saying that he initiated you,—yet it is **NOT THE FACT**, that he initiated you “into the original Chapter.” You must allow me to mark that part of your assertion, as being wholly unsupported by evidence, and also, manifestly contradictory to the facts. For, if you had been initiated “in the original Chapter”—i.e., in the primitive Chapter, properly so called,—we, the said original or primitive Chapter, would have the minutes of that transaction upon our books. You were, as I have before said, initiated “under the rose,”—by Darling, perhaps,—but, certainly, not into Darling’s Chapter,—nor, indeed, into any Chapter, for there was none in existence at the time, except that to which I now belong, namely, the Chapter of Peree,—alias, the Grand Chapter of Ireland,—alias, the true original, or primitive Kilwinning Chapter of 1782,—whereof Darling was continued as Sovereign in 1784, and whereof he continued to be a member for many years after. No, you were initiated into (what is now called) the Council of Rites,—alias, the *soi disant* “original” Chapter, which assumed that name after the expulsion of Zimmerman,—alias, the Chapter of Zimmerman, which, as our minutes prove, was in progress of formation in 1799.

And, here, let me ask you *obiter*, if that Chapter,—which was

in progress of formation in 1799, under the auspices of Zimmerman, aided by the temporary patronage of Darling,—be not your Chapter, what has become of the former? That is a *NUT*, which you, Brother Fowler, will never be able to digest,—it is an argument you cannot answer,—and with that query I might safely conclude, but that I am determined to make this letter sound the passing bell of your Chapter's existence. It has for years been the *opprobrium Laetomiae*—the scourge and the shame of Irish Masonry,—the hour of its dissolution, and of its unhonored funeral, is at hand,—and I will here venture to predict, that, so far as regards the opinions of all impartial, honorable, and intelligent members of the order, the unanswerable arguments of this letter, will render the destruction of the authority, the power, the claims, the character, and the *credit*, of the Council of Rites, “*unfair accompli*.”

To proceed, then:—So far from Perec being the first Sovereign of the Grand Chapter, we have, as I have observed, minutes so far back as the year 1784,—only two years after the period at which you say the Order of Rose Croix was introduced into this country; and, even at that early period, our Chapter appears in full force and operation,—not then merely beginning to exist. The first entry in the record, being of Easter Monday, 1784, states that Sisson Darling was continued in his office; and there are, also, NEW rules mentioned, and members called upon to pay up *ARBEARS*,—which must have been *then* considerable, because the penalty for non-payment, therein specified, is that the defaulters should “be discontinued.”

Now these, and all subsequent entries in succession, we have freely, openly, and undisguisedly, shown to the most distinguished members of the Freemasonic community, of this, and of other countries,—these minutes have been open for inspection to all respectable and impartial persons, desirous of obtaining the degree of P. G. R. C., or otherwise seriously interested in the question of our title; but I do not find that you have ever *unreservedly* shown your minutes to any person. I say that, on the contrary, you—*i.e.* the Council of Rites,—refused our proposals, for a mutual, complete, searching, and effective investigation; and I say that you will abide for ever in that refusal.

You may, indeed, point out to inexperienced persons, some isolated entries in a book, which, if it contains a minute of the initiation of John Peree, is, by that fact, proved to be the property of the Grand Chapter—not yours. Or you may exhibit letters from the infamous Zimmerman, in which he may, perhaps, have made statements covering his own imposition; and, therefore, favourable to the body, which sprung from, and continued, that imposture—namely, the Council of Rites. But to our frequent proposals for a complete disclosure of title, you have never submitted,—and I declare, without fear of contradiction, that you never will.

And where did you procure these entries? How came into your hands the Book in which these entries are contained? I confess, that, at the present moment, I cannot prove, otherwise than by hearsay evidence, by what hands this, our lost property, was found and delivered over,—in mistake, I believe,—to a

member of your Chapter. I will, therefore, say I know not,—because I cannot, at this moment, prove to demonstration, how you did come by it. And, in this respect we are quite upon equal terms; for neither can you show how you CAME BY IT, how or wherefore you are entitled to it, or by what authority you hold it. It is a simple case of “trover and conversion.” You, indeed, hold the property,—nobody knows wherefore; nor can you yourself conveniently or prudently explain; whilst I prove, simply, that the said property belongs to us.

Here, then, is another ~~nut~~—I assert, and will join issue with you upon this statement, that you can shew no title to the possession of any genuine record, or indeed to any records whatsoever, previous to those cooked up by Zimmerman, or by yourself, in or about the period 1798—1800, concerning the transactions of the illegal Chapter, which made its first appearance at that time, when Zimmerman commenced his vicious career.

I must here explain, that I by no means intend to say, that the character of Zimmerman was unsullied, when he *commenced* his system of deception among the Masons of Dublin. It was not, probably, even then *known* to be bad,—nor certainly, could it have been *suspected* to be so when, a few years previously, he was permitted to take a conspicuous part in the transactions of the Grand Chapter. But, our transaction book, even alone, affords some confirmation of the opinion, that, for a considerable time previous to his conviction, his conduct was the object of suspicious remark. This, however, is mere matter of inference, and conjecture; and before I proceed farther with suppositions, however probable, I shall, in the first instance, mention a few *certainties*.

On the 3rd of February, 1800, this Zimmerman was expelled from the Grand Chapter, which was then, as now, composed of Gentlemen of respectability and character,—the cause expressed in that sentence, being, that he had *wilfully violated his duties and obligations*, as a member of the order of Rose Croix.

Those alone, who have, with proper solemnity, undertaken these duties, can form an adequate idea of the baseness, which would justify such a censure: nor do I feel myself at liberty to be more explicit with you upon this subject, than to assure you, that the charge, upon which he was found guilty, implies an infamous offence, which,—had it been cognizable by the laws of the land,—he would have expiated on the pillory. And who were his judges on that occasion?

First,—John Boardman, M.W.S.—the most distinguished Irish Mason then living.

Secondly,—Sisson Putland Darling,—acting *pro tem.* as S. G. Warden,—being himself implicated in the accusation, but, by his conduct upon this (as upon several subsequent occasions), proving, that his error had not been wilful, but the result of the deceptions of Zimmerman.

Thirdly,—Christopher Abbott was also present on the occasion of Zimmerman's expulsion. I believe I need not tell you, that the late Alderman Abbott was a respectable person; that he was elected to the highest honours which his fellow-citizens could con-

fer upon him,—those of **Lord Mayor** of the **City of Dublin** ; and that he preserved an unblemished reputation through life.

Fourthly,—James Blacker, late one of the divisional magistrates of Police. Few of the inhabitants of Dublin, who have any acquaintance with that city, can be ignorant, that Mr. Blacker was a gentleman of high honour, and of the most established reputation. He was, also, a person of great good-nature and kindness; and it is utterly incredible, that, with his sanction, the brand of infamy would have been affixed to the name of a brother in the order, had not the punishment been just.

Of the other names, which I find in the list of our members who attended upon the above occasion, I am unable to say more, than that I understand them to be those of persons of respectability,—fit associates of the men whom I have now described; and of whom I am enabled to speak in terms of positive assurance. Nearly half a century has elapsed; and, therefore, it is not wonderful that I,—who was not in existence at the time,—should now be unable to give an exact memoir of each and every one of the parties in this unfortunate transaction,—all of whom,—the judges, as well as the culprit,—are now numbered amongst the dead,—leaving but few of their contemporaries in the Order behind. These few, indeed, are hardy plants; and so likely to preserve a green maturity for many years to come, that it is to be hoped, that *One* of them, at least, will long out-live the period when the corporate existence of the Council of Rites shall be reduced to the same condition of non-entity,—in which it was when You almost exclusively composed it. Such, then, was “the Court” (and it is, perhaps, rather extraordinary, that circumstances have enabled me to fill up so many authentic sketches of the persons concerned) before whom Zimmerman was arraigned, and condemned,—*that* Zimmerman, whom your Chapter, you say, “respects”—*that* Zimmerman, who, being, (you say) the “intimate friend of Peree,” used all underhand, covert exertions, to establish a spurious rival to the favourite Society over which the object of his “friendship” presided,—and who,—the very instant that the breath was out of the body of his “friend,”—whom he courted when alive,—threw off the mask, and abandoning all decency, made open profession, and avowal, of those acts of unprincipled baseness, which he had the effrontery to vindicate! How can this man be respected? *He*, of whom these things are *certain*, which I have above detailed; but of whom much more has been, not without reason, suspected! Is it not strange that *you* have never come forward, to vindicate, against prevalent, and by no means improbable rumours, the man who, you admit, introduced you into one of the highest orders of Masonry, and who devolved upon your shoulders his Masonic mantle?

From the following extracts, from the celebrated work of Professor Robinson, you may judge for yourself, whether these rumours are too far fetched, and incredible, to deserve notice, or to need refutation.

At p.p. 407, 408, of his “Proofs of a conspiracy, &c.,” the Doctor writes,—“A little book, just now printed, with the title *Paragraphen*, says, that Zimmerman, of whom I have spoken more than once, went to France to preach liberty.

He had formerly been a most successful missionary of *Illuminism*. Of his former proceedings, the following is a curious anecdote :—He connected himself with a highly accomplished and beautiful woman, whose conversation had such charms, that he says, she gained him near 100 converts in Spire alone. Some persons, of high rank, and great exterior dignity of character, had felt more tender impressions ; and when the lady informed them of certain consequences to their reputation, they were glad to compound matters with her friend, Mr. Zimmerman—who either passed for her husband, or took the scandal on himself. He made about 1500 Louis d'ors in this way. When he returned as a preacher of revolution, he used to mount the pulpit with a sabre in his hand, and bawl out, ‘Behold, Frenchmen, this is your God—this alone can save you.’ The author adds \* \* \* \* \* [Here follows a story of an absurd piece of treachery, which Zimmerman offered to commit, by betraying Manheim into the hands of the French General, which proposal that officer rejected with disdain.] “Zimmerman found his full account in Robespierre's bloody sway,—but the short term of his atrocities was also the whole of Zimmerman's career. He was arrested, but again liberated, and soon after again imprisoned; *after which I can learn no more of him.* \* \* \* \* \*

The above is evidently a loose and rambling sort of narrative, to the accuracy of the specific details of which, it would be very unsafe to subscribe ; but I think there can be no doubt that it establishes this fact, that, towards the latter end of the last century,—say about the year 1790,—a person named Zimmerman had made himself infamously conspicuous in Germany, and that he was a zealous promoter of the system of illuminism, and occult masonry. It is evident this could not have been Dr. John George Zimmerman, who, I believe, wrote the essay on Solitude, and whom Professor Robinson calls, the “respectable Physician to the King of Prussia. The latter was a person of good reputation ; and, therefore, could not have been the Zimmerman who is here described, and whose conduct seems so much of a piece with that of Emmanuel Zimmerman, who, a few years after, selected Dublin for the scene of his exploits, and there violated his obligations, and betrayed the confidence of his friends. I observe, too, that after the time of Robespierre, who was assassinated in 1794, neither Dr. Robinson, nor the German author of the *Paragraphen*, the countryman of Zimmerman, could “hear more of him.” Now, in 1794, Emmanuel Zimmerman had *returned* to Ireland, and appears as a member of the Grand Chapter, for the first time after his absence ; and he seems, during several subsequent years, to have lurked about Dublin, which was, at that unhappy period, the *sentinum*, into which profligate agents and adventurers of every kind crowded, for the purpose of carrying out, by all sorts of artifices, various schemes, political and mercenary.

You may say, that if the Zimmerman of Dr. Robinson's narrative was personally in Paris during the whole time of the “sway” of Robespierre, he could not be the same person by whom your Chapter was founded. But might he not have “found his account” in those revolutionary proceedings,—might he not have

participated in the profits of confiscations, and received his bribes out of the general plunder, without being personally present at the scene? And, at all events, he might have made his escape seasonably in the autumn or winter of 1793, before the tyrant had proceeded to his last atrocities, of including his own followers among his victims. In point of fact, however, I conceive it unnecessary to resort to such explanations, because a loose *incidental* passage, such as I have above quoted, cannot possibly be read or construed aright, if we proceed to criticise it upon the supposition, that the author had carefully investigated every fact in detail. *He had no occasion or reason for doing so.* *He only wished to show,*—what, in fact, *I only infer* from this part of his book,—that there was a person of the name of Zimmerman,—a man of noted bad character,—who was connected with the propagation of mischievous doctrines under the name of Freemasonry, *previous to* the final scenes of bloodshed which ensued under Robespierre. I now come to another passage, which is evidently written with a greater care of details, and which is more to be depended upon than that above quoted, because Dr. Robinson (as you will find) refers to a better authority than to the author of an “anonymous pamphlet,” such as the Paragraphen was.—

At page 357 the Professor says—

“Zimmerman, who had been president of the Illuminati in Manheim, was also a most active person in propagating their doctrines in other countries. He was employed as a missionary, and erected some Lodges even in Rome,—also at Neufchatel,—and in Hungary. *He was frequently seen in the latter place by a gentleman of my acquaintance*; and preached up all the *ostensible* doctrines of Illuminatism, in the most public manner, and made many proselytes. But, when it was discovered that their real and fundamental doctrines were different from those, which he *professed*, in order to draw in proselytes, Zimmerman left the country in haste. Some time after this, he was arrested *in Prussia.*” [This seems the true version, not that vague report which is given in the Paragraphen, and which would lead to the supposition, that he became a *public* and notorious character in France, and was arrested *there*,—for the author goes on to say:] “but he escaped,” (that is from *Prussia*) “and *has not SINCE been heard of.* When he was in Hungary, he boasted of having erected above 100 lodges in different parts of Europe,—SOME OF WHICH WERE IN ENGLAND.” Now, we have only to weigh probabilities, and decide according to the balance of evidence. It seems probable, that the Zimmerman, who is mentioned in this latter passage, is the same individual who is the subject of that first quoted. The question, then, is, whether or not this Zimmerman, of whom Dr. Robinson speaks, is, or is not, the same personage who, having visited Dublin, [at the time when that city was the resort of all political sharpers, agents, and incendiaries,] contrived, under the guise of Free-Masonry, to gain admittance there, for a short time, into respectable society; in which, he soon became an object of suspicion; and from which, upon being detected in a course of treachery, he was ultimately expelled. The similarity of conduct is remarkable,—and the circumstance, of *each*,—if they, in reality, were different persons,—having been of

a ROVING disposition, renders the coincidence still more extraordinary. The Zimmerman of Dr. Robinson's account, after having rambled over several of the nations of the continent, as a sort of field-preacher of sedition,—and after having introduced some rudiments of his fanaticism even into "England,"—suddenly disappears, and is no more seen among his countrymen.

Meanwhile, a Mr. Zimmerman has made his appearance both in England and Ireland; but with what objects or purposes, save those of a wandering speculator, has never been explained. He first appears in Ireland in 1782. I can "hear no more of him" after that until 1787, when he is mentioned as having then lately *visited* the London College, of which I have before spoken. Again, he re-appears in Ireland in 1794; and in 1804,—*non est inventus* again,—he appears not upon your published list. When he left this country, or when or where he died, I have been unable to procure any certain information; but the report is, that, after his disgrace in Dublin,—and finding, in that city, a less flourishing market than he had expected for his commodities, he ventured to return to the continent, about the commencement of the present century,—was recognized and arrested there,—and ended his days upon the scaffold.

I must confess, it does appear to me an improbable supposition, that two such extraordinary vagabonds,—both of them professors of new and strange systems, purporting to be masonic,—both of them frequenting the scenes of disturbance and political *mauvaise*,—both of them rambling cosmopolitans, in the largest sense of the word,—without any apparent settled home, or any known regular occupation, except free-masonry and mischief,—should BOTH have flourished cotemporaries, and bearing the same name; and, when to these considerations, which certainly afford *prima facie* evidence of identity, we add—1st, that Zimmerman of Manheim boasted of having formed Lodges of the superior orders of Masonry in England,—(*i. e.* of course, in parts of the realm under the Sovereignty of the King of England, and where the English language was spoken),—and 2d, that Zimmerman of Dublin actually did "assist at the establishment of the Rose Croix" there, and also took part in the transactions of the London College,—what must be our conclusion from these facts, but, that the burden of proof lies upon the advocate of your "respected" Brother, and instructor, Emmanuel Zimmerman, to shew that *another* Zimmerman,—the *ditto*, duplicate, and counterpart of the first,—did actually take a like conspicuous part, in the working and establishment of the higher degrees of Masonry, in these Kingdoms.

Zimmerman, of Manheim, boasted that he had formed Lodges here.

Zimmerman, of Dublin, has realized this boast.

It must, therefore, I think, be *presumed*,—and I only mention it as matter of probable inference,—that these two Zimmersmans are, in fact, one and the same person,—until you shew us that there was a second.

Before I have "done" with Zimmerman, I shall here relate to you a very curious anecdote, which I suspect you have not heard before, and which may help to throw some light upon the present subject.

At the head of the London College, which I have mentioned,—whereof Laurent was Chancellor, and with which Zimmerman, though not a member of it, appears to have been in connection,—was one *M. Lambert de Lintot*. I shall now quote from a letter written in the year 1820, by Walter Rodwell Wright, Esq., then Justice General of Malta, and who had previously been Grand Master of the Knights Templars in England.

"The French Masons differ considerably from ours in their ceremonial, &c., of the Christian, as well as of the more ancient degrees. They are more full of pageantry, dramatic representation, and tedious forms, but not nearly so concrete in substance. In fact, the French Masons have (or had) so far given in to that system of the *Illuminati*, that they set little store by degrees, which were only considered as a passport to others of a very different import. Their favourite degrees were \* \* \* \* &c., from which they plunged into the 'Knights of the Sun' of the Sylphs,'—and 'Minerva'; in which last, God and Nature are declared to be synonymous, and revelation an imposture.—*This I speak from my own knowledge*,—not as having received those degrees, but as having, in my character of Grand Master of Knights Templars, taken possession of a trunk containing the papers of a Mons. *Lambert de Lintot*, about 25 years ago acting as *missionary*, to endeavour to make proselytes among the English Masons, of the higher degrees; which design was completely frustrated, by the prudence, and firmness, of those who, at that period, held the command of the Christian orders!"

Such was this *Lambert de Lintot*,—the principal of the Seminary in which Zimmerman was wont to practice his exercises! And have we not reason to suppose, that a community of sentiment, and a mutuality of purpose, subsisted betwixt these *arcades ambo*,”—these two amiable friends?

But,—to return from this wretch,—I do not think that I can be accused of harshness or severity, in dealing thus plainly with your letter, and with the subjects to which it and mine refer, namely, the conduct and origin, the character and policy, the pretensions and memoirs, of the Council of Rites. Towards yourself, personally, I have, I believe, shown every possible mark of respect and courtesy,—at least, I am sure it has been my anxious wish to do so, while I neglected not the interests of truth.—But I cannot say that I have felt much consideration for the Council of Rites, or much sympathy for the sufferings, which the promulgation of FACTS is calculated to inflict upon it. For, how little does that body deserve to be treated, or dealt with, otherwise than as an outlaw from civilization, which has allowed, and still permits, one of its *Grand officers*,—a prime agent and manager of its affairs, and an influential director of its proceedings,—to print and circulate those abominable libels, which yearly issue from the press, purporting to be the proclamation of the Council of Rites, cautioning the public against "imposition?" Would I, or any member of the Grand Chapter, included in this ribald caution, be justified in such a waste and misapplication of civility, as to fling the pearl of courtesy to these graceless swine? Or what terms can any man of honour be expected to keep with a

body, which has the unparalleled impudence to taunt the Grand Chapter with insulting allusions, and inuendoes, concerning ERASURES in its Books? You are well aware that one of the members of your Chapter, of whose outrageous proceedings I believe that Chapter is itself beginning to feel ashamed, saw fit to distribute, in the autumn of the year 1840, a printed circular, wherein the following sentence (among a mass of other impertinence) occurs.

“ In the *mysterious Book.*” (*i.e.*—the old record of the Grand Chapter, which *mysterious* book is open for almost *public* inspection);—“ in the *mysterious book* alluded to, the *interpolation!* written on an *erasure*,—purporting to expel him (E. Zimmerman,) is a *FORGERY*, and of *VERY RECENT DATE*. *EVERY* one! of the assertions contained in the foregoing production,” (two letters of Mr. Ellis, since published in the “ *Few Words.*” are what is meant by the ‘ *foregoing production*,’) are, **ONE AND ALL**, equally groundless !!!!”

These assertions,—which assuredly entitle their matchless author to be considered as **THE THERSITES OF FREEMASONRY**,—have been taken up and re-echoed to such an extent, that, when I was Sovereign of the Grand Chapter, gentlemen, whom I had not even seen before, wrote to me to enquire, if it could be possible that these charges were well founded, and asking me for an explanation, or account of the facts; and what, think you, were my answers? I replied, —pledging my veracity to the truth of what I stated,—that there were erasures in our records, as there must be in all books of manuscript, but, that there were no erasures which could afford the slightest grounds for a suspicion, that there had been any falsification of our proceedings. I said, with respect to the minute concerning Zimmerman’s expulsion, that it was only one of a long series of minutes upon the same subject, and that if, instead of words being written upon an erasure, the whole passage had been totally obliterated, or cut wholly out of the volume, the context would be sufficient to supply it. I said, that the words, so written over an erasure, were **MANIFESTLY** written by the same hand which penned the other parts of the book, the antiquity of which not only can be proved by unquestionable evidence, but is also manifest upon the face of the record itself, from the faded color of the ink,—nay,—from the very paper and style of the *binding* of the book. I said that the Grand Chapter could, at no time of its existence, have had an object of adequate importance to account for the commission of such a fraud,—because the expulsion, or non-expulsion, of Zimmerman, could not in the slightest degree affect the title of the Grand Chapter, nor materially vary, or affect, the stain which adheres to the *Couneil of Rites*, as the offspring of perjury and imposition. Moreover, I said that you, Br. John Fowler, had, in couversation with Br. Herculos Ellis, distinctly stated to that gentleman, that you had, and still continued to hold, in your possession, letters written by Zimmerman himself, *in which he (E. Zimmerman) distinctly admitted and mentioned the fact of his expulsion from the Grand Chapter*, but attempted to get rid of the consequences of that expulsion, by maintaining that the Grand Chapter had no power or authority to pass such a

sentence!\* I said that no person had ever presumed to make such an accusation, except behind our backs ; and that, although the utmost pains were taken to disseminate these infamous charges, equal caution was observed, that they should circulate only in confidential whispers ; and that the calumniators should be secured from responsibility. Further, I said, that the Council of Rites would never venture to join issue upon the authenticity of this entry. I now repeat, that it never will ; while, at the same time, I announce for form's sake, what it must be superfluous to tell *you*, viz. : that the Grand Chapter is perfectly ready to rest upon this single question, the whole case between it and the Council of Rites.

Finally, I said, that Dr. Crucifix, the originator, I believe, of the Freemason's Review, had seen the whole of our records, his attention being particularly solicited to all parts in which there was the slightest appearance of erasure ; and that he was, —as he still continues to be, entirely satisfied of their purity ;—that Dr. Mant, also, had investigated them with the most scrutinizing minuteness ; and that he was,—as he still continues to be,—convinced that they do not contain one item that is not authentic. And I say now, that I can appeal to several other gentlemen of distinction, of long experience in masonic affairs, of high character, and of acknowledged talents,—in England, Scotland, and Ireland,—whose unqualified judgment, respecting this matter in particular, and also respecting the claims of the Grand Chapter in general, enables even the most *tetchy* and irritable of its members, to hear with composure the iteration of those *stale* and impotent slanders, which can now bring discredit, only upon the lips that utter them.

I now turn to the concluding passage of your letter, in which you say, that “the Council of Rites is not the descendant of any particular Lodge, or Chapter, but a representative body, consisting of delegates from various high orders of masonry, being established, like the Grand Encampment of Knights Templars, under the authority of his Grace the Duke of Leinster, and embracing, like the Grand Orient in France, the Rose Croix, and all the orders above it.”

This reads well, and shews what beautiful tints the prism of a fine imagination can lend to the most unsightly objects. But do I, at this time of day, require to be told how the Council of Rites was formed? Do I not know, that it was composed of the members of your Chapter, *i.e.*—of the Chapter of Zimmerman—**AND OF THOSE ALONE**; without the assent, consent, or adhesion, of any other chapter, or body in existence. When that awful pair of scoundrels, the Bedarides, came over to Ireland in 1825, they sold to you, and to some few other members of your chapter, certain spurious degrees,—your chapter thus became, in a certain sense, *another chapter, quoad those degrees*,—but still it

\* The way in which Zimmerman attempted to prove this last doctrine, was, by asserting that he had never been a *member* of the Grand Chapter, though he had originally visited it.

Now, I have told you he was not a member of the London College. What then was his title; and what is yours? It far easier to show what these “titles” are not—than what they are.

did not cease to be the chapter of Zimmerman. Your "delegates from various high orders" thus turn out to be neither more nor less than Messieurs Fowler and *Co.*, the head of the firm being the only party capable of carrying on its business, or of giving a decent appearance to the job. Your coadjutors were, doubtless, useful, nay indispensible, in their way; as gutter-agents are at an election for members of Parliament; or as bill-stickers are to any mercantile concern. These gentlemen did all the "dirty work." They packed the Grand Lodge—they abused some, and threatened others,—and heartily pelted the regular masons of the superior degrees, with libels and insults. They coaxed the Duke of Leinster into your stall; and as soon as His Grace was nailed to the bargain,—they raised a cry of treason against those who chose to deal elsewhere!—which cry of treason has misled many worthy men. You, however, were the head, and head-piece, of the whole system,—the key-stone which bound the arch,—and, without your assistance, the whole fabric would have crumbled into ruins. Observe,—I do not say this scheme originated with you; much less do I say that you have ever descended to that course of undividing barbarism which some have adopted. Had I thought so, I could never have addressed you in those terms of respect, which it is my delight to use towards a gentleman of your long standing in the order. You, however, held an almost undisputed monopoly of the brains of your party,—at least, of that section of it, which led the rest. Aided by you, a few of these constituted themselves into lodges of "various higher degrees;" and thus was the Council of Rites formed,—wholly and entirely, by, and out of, the Chapter of Zimmerman,—or rather by a few members of it, who resolved to constitute themselves into what the Author of the anonymous tract properly terms "a Kakistocracy," for the misgovernment of the Freemasonic order.

Thus, and thus only,—arose the Supreme Grand Council of Rites for Ireland &c.; at the bidding of some half-dozen persons, who now occupy a strange, and "unnatural position, of consequence among the Freemasons of Dublin." Thus the Council of Rites was formed,—in a manner wholly *unlike* that, in which the Supreme body of the Knights Templars of Ireland was constructed; nor do I think you will be better able to make good your comparison with the Grand Orient of France. No,—the Council of Rites is not *orient* but *couchant*,—its ominous glare now trembles upon the verge of the Masonic horizon; and all men interested in the well-being,—the purity,—the respectability of the order,—regard its departure, as the astrologers would have viewed a receding comet, that seemed charged with pestilential influences,—or, as the spell-bound Knight—in times when feats of magic were more usual than they are at present,—would have contemplated the hour of his deliverance from the vengeance,—or the caresses,—of the loathsome Hag, by whom he had been enthralled.

I remain, dear Brother Fowler,

Most fraternally yours,

† H. O'C.,

P.M. W.S.P.G.R.C. of the GRAND  
CHAPTER OF IRELAND.

August, 1814.

The above letter, having been written upon scattered sheets, at different times during the Summer, and in different places, while the writer was absent from home,—no convenient or safe opportunity occurred of having a copy taken,—and Mr. Fowler, therefore, did not receive this letter, until shortly after Mr. O'Connor's return to Dublin, when it was, on the 23d of October, delivered into Mr. Fowler's hands, by Brother John MacNally, a highly respectable member of the Grand Chapter. But, during the Summer vacation, several circumstances had taken place, of which Mr. O'Connor had received no intimation at the time of their occurrence, nor until after the above letter had been written, and shewn to some gentlemen of great distinction and consequence in the Masonic Order, who were pleased to express their approval of it, and their conviction of the unanswerable nature of its contents. The necessity of some allusion being made to these circumstances, gave occasion to the following **POSTSCRIPT**, which was written on the day previous to its delivery to Mr. Fowler, enclosed in the same cover, which contained the above.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Long as this letter has been, you, Brother Fowler, are well aware, that twice its space would be insufficient to contain even a bare enumeration of the disingenuous proceedings of the Council of Rites, and of the numerous misdeeds of its dishonest policy. Even while I write, a fresh instance has come before me, of the indirectness of its conduct, and the impurity of its motives, in the evidence, which I have just received, of an attempt recently made upon behalf of your Chapter,—acting under cover of a truce, and by the pretence of an anxiety for reconciliation,—to obtain from us, by *finesse* and falsehood, a recognition and acknowledgment of your title. Insult, aggression, and the arts of proselytism and corruption, having failed to put down our honest cause, the “last move,” in this unmasonic and ungentlemanly game has been, to suggest to three principal officers of the Grand Chapter, that, if they would consent to make certain proposals to the Council of Rites, such proposals would be instantly acceded to, and peace accordingly be restored. I have it in evidence, that these proposals *were* made,—and what followed? They *were REJECTED!* New proposals were then suggested, for us to adopt, and proffer; but of a totally different nature from those which had been in the first instance extracted, for the special purpose, it must be presumed, of inducing the Grand Chapter in such first proposals, to make some sort of recognition of the title of the Council of Rites,—and thus, to give a “character” to the Chapter of Zimmerman. The object having been—(as the Council of Rites supposed), thus achieved, the course, adopted by that unscrupulous body, was to reject these offers, and tender a draft of proposals, which every member of the Council of Rites must have known were such as never could be adopted by the Grand Chapter. The effect of the first proposals, was simply to admit the legality of the Council of Rites, upon the

terms of the legality and title of the Grand Chapter being acknowledged in return; and so far as that, the officers of the Grand Chapter, acting on their own responsibility, and without consulting the Chapter, or any of its members,—were willing to concede, upon the distinct understanding, that upon such proposals being made, the whole dispute would be at an end. But the second proposals suggested in the draft, which was tendered after the rejection of the first by the Council of Rites, contained nothing less than an offer to accept a warrant from the Chapter of Zimmerman, and to submit to a re-initiation of our members. Such degrading terms were, of course, at once rejected,—and when, afterwards, the original documents, containing the proposals of the Grand Chapter, which had been refused by the Council of Rites, were demanded of its Vice-President, he refused to return them, alleging that they had passed out of his possession.

Now, independently of any specific arrangement, to which there is no occasion to allude, it must be admitted that Mr. John Norman ought not to have parted with these papers,—containing as they did, his own suggestions, adopted and signed by the officers of the Grand Chapter,—until he was well assured that the statements which he had made, (upon the faith of which, these suggestions had been agreed to, and the papers containing them confided to his care,) would have been verified. The Council of Rites, however, it must be presumed, was the only party guilty of a breach of faith, and that Mr. Norman was acting under the erroneous impression, that even though that body might repudiate the engagements of its Vice-President, (engagements which, I have no doubt he was authorised to make,) it would not, at all events, endeavour to fix upon him the responsibility of refusing to restore those documents, which were intended to have been made no use of, except in the case of the previous arrangement being adhered to, namely, that, upon these offers being sent to the Council of Rites, they would be accepted without further trouble.

I say, the terms of the proposals suggested in the second instance, were degrading; and the Council of Rites well knew that they would so be considered by every member of our body. To prove this assertion, it is enough to observe, that by these second proposals, which we refused to sanction, we would have bound ourselves to nothing less than the acceptance of a *Warrant* / from the *Council of Rites* ! / and have submitted to a re-initiation of our members. On a former occasion, indeed, we would have assented to the hard terms of a re-initiation,—but that was in the year 1842, when the case presented a very different aspect. Matters have come to our knowledge since that date, which were then unknown to us,—and circumstances also have occurred which must for ever prevent us from accepting even peace itself upon such intolerable conditions. When the Grand Chapter,—in opposition to the advice of some of its most zealous members,—did, through its organ, the committee, which addressed the Duke of Leinster in that year, offer to submit to the ceremony of a re-initiation,—

(*vide the Few Words*, p. 33),—it yielded that uttermost concession to *His Grace*, for the reasons specified in the tract just referred to,—*His Grace* having urged the fact of his own son having set the example, and the Grand Council conceiving that its refusal in such a case, might be construed into an insult to the Marquis of Kildare, who had subdued his scruples, [if he ever entertained any] respecting the propriety of such a measure, and to the Duke, who had approved of, and recommended to us, that course. But such a concession was never made to the Council of Rites,—nor could it now be offered out of deference to any party or personage, however distinguished,—nor is the case of the Marquis now applicable, or at all analogous, whatever it may have seemed to be upon the former occasion.

Thus, it appears that an attempt was made to impose upon the understanding of the Grand Chapter, by tampering with its best feelings, and kind disposition, to advance to the farthest limits of propriety in any negociation for the establishment of peace. First.—in verbal conversation, the imprudence of listening to which, from such a source, cannot be questioned,—it was represented to our three officers, during the summer recess, that if certain proposals were made by them upon behalf of the Grand Chapter, they would instantly be acceded to,—these proposals being, in substance, nearly the same that Archdeacon Mant (an honorary member of Zimmerman's Chapter, but deriving his title as a P.G.R.C. from a regular English Chapter, recognised by the Grand Chapter of Ireland,) had recently admitted to be the *ultimatum* which the Grand Chapter could adopt. But, afterwards, other proposals, totally at variance with those which had been agreed to in *viva voce* communications, were tendered to our officers to sign. Thus, the dealing in this matter was consistently enough like that of a roguish shopkeeper, who proposes to sell you a particular article according to sample, but, after having arranged the bargain, and received earnest, cuts his measure from an inferior piece; or, like that of a pettifogging attorney, who misrepresents the tenor of an instrument which he hands to you to execute as your act and deed.

But I will enter no further into this disgusting subject. In the foregoing letter I have said quite enough,—more than enough,—to excite the indignation of every honourable member of the Order, against a clique, which *will*, because it *must*, with tame submission, and in helpless silence, listen, and submit to the charges and accusations which that letter contains;—because that clique cannot venture ever to join issue upon them; will not attempt to refute them; but will always, as heretofore, refuse all fair offers of discussion, investigation, arbitration, or impartial decision upon these subjects, wherein it is left without the slightest chance, or hope, of being able, by any ingenuity or casuistry, to resist or evade the unanswerable proofs, by which these accusations are sustained. These charges are, few of them, new. We find them in books and periodicals of every description; but we find no answer. They are the common topics of

conversation, and of wonder, among the Masonic community, not in Ireland alone, but also in Scotland, and in England,—yet the answer is nowhere to be found. In the Commercial Buildings, in the presence of hundreds, they have made the walls ring,—and if, amidst that assembly, comprising the whole force of the Council of Rites, with all its defendants and retainers, you ask, “*Where* is the answer?” Echo answers “*Where!*” Even beyond the ranks of the Masonic community, among the citizens of Dublin generally, and to a large number of gentlemen residing in the country parts of Ireland, it has become known that a disgraceful schism exists among “the Brethren,” and that the Order is divided into two parties,—one calling out for examination and inquiry, and making over and over again the most liberal offers and proposals, for the purpose of restoring peace;—the other refusing every offer of investigation,—rejecting every concession,—cushioning all enquiry, and perpetually calling out for the extermination of its opponents. And it is equally well known that the latter is the faction which the Duke of Leinster has the misfortune to patronise, and which, I fully believe, has received the last act of grace that that excellent Nobleman will ever bestow upon it. For whatever his Grace may generously do, or forbear, from consideration, and kindness, and lenity towards those who have abused his confidence, and outraged his sense of justice,—we are sure that he will never degrade his rank, nor sully his high personal character as a peer and a gentleman, by participating in the mischievous, and cowardly, and impudent proceedings, of which I have described only a part; and of which, were I to describe them all, the Council of Rites would still be coerced to listen “*auditor tantum*” to the cruel details; because it has not one word or syllable of truth,—one sentence or argument that would bear a moment’s investigation,—to allege in its defence.

Thus, therefore, I leave your Chapter to abide the results of public opinion, consequent upon these notorious facts.

I have now done my duty, which I feel that I would have abandoned, if I had hesitated to stigmatize a flagrant and mischievous imposition, by its proper title.

Insignificant as the *casus belli* may be deemed,—the contests, to which it has given birth, cannot be considered unimportant; because, upon the mode in which they have been conducted by the Grand Chapter and the Council of Rites, respectively, will depend the opinion, that must be formed not alone by the Free-masonic community, but by a considerable portion of the public at large, respecting the character of either of these societies,—and the personal character, honor, and credit, of the individuals who compose it. I, therefore, felt that I would not have been justified, had I trifled upon such subjects, or made my attack upon the Council of Rites, mere child’s play. I fully admit, however, that there are some individuals connected with that body, who are the victims, and not the promoters, of its iniquitous principles,—and I should be truly sorry, if anything, that I have ever said, or done, or written, should give offence to the feelings

of those, whose intentions are pure,—and who either act under a delusion, or are entirely ignorant of the true nature of the cause,—in which they are nominally enlisted, but take no active part,—or who, being awakened at the **ELEVENTH HOUR**, to a perception of realities, and to a just sense of their position, already suffer sufficiently from the galling of those stringent ties, which bind them with (certainly) worthless associates, in a vicious, and disreputable career.

I must also admit, that it behoves me to be prepared with the proofs of these bold accusations, which I have put forth in the foregoing letter, and which I here coolly, deliberately, and advisedly, repeat. But, I think I have shown you that I *am* prepared,—**FULLY PREPARED**,—to join issue with you concerning all and each of the averments, in said letter contained, in manner and form as they are expressed therein,—from the address down to the signature.

Thus, I have endeavoured to perform my duty to the Craft in general, and particularly to that respectable, but grossly injured and insulted body, the Grand Chapter of Ireland.

But there is another duty which I owe to myself—and that is, to retire, as far as the general rules of the Freemasonic constitution permit, from all connection with that once honourable and respectable fraternity, until it shall cease to tolerate such a **SCANDALOUS INCUBUS**, and to sanction and serve as its Master, the contemptible *coterie*, which skulks from investigation, and is afraid to meet, before any impartial tribunal, or subject to any unprejudiced decision, such charges as have been alleged, and proved, against it.

HENRY O'CONNOR.

---

#### TO THE FREEMASONIC COMMUNITY.

Upwards of nine weeks have now elapsed, but Mr. Fowler has not deemed it prudent to attempt a reply to any part whatsoever of the above demolishing case, which Mr. O'Connor has, in his letter, dated August 1844, so completely substantiated. It cannot be doubted that Mr. Fowler has exhibited this correspondence in MS. to his friends of “the Council of Rites,”—yet no answer or reply has been attempted, by any of the members of that unfortunate conclave. The Masonic public will, therefore, judge for themselves, *whether* they will rest satisfied under the self-constituted domination of a few mischievous and impudent pretenders, who, crest-fallen upon every appeal to truth, or evidence,—to reason, or to justice,—betake themselves to their holes and hiding-places, like birds obscene at the approach of day;—or *whether* they will give an honest and generous support to the Grand Chapter, which is anxious for investigation,—which courts inquiry,—which is desirous to promote the harmony, and the respectability, of the order,—which has already received the

sanction, and commanded the approbation, of the best and most accomplished Freemasons in the world,—many of whom are upon its list of members;—and which is now so recklessly, and impudently, libelled and outraged, by those, who are a discredit to the Craft,—indeed, a disgrace to this country.



JAMES GRAY, PRINTER, MARYBORO'.